





Noticed





Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2007 with funding from
Microsoft Corporation



THE OLD AND THE NEW MAN:

OR,

SIN AND SALVATION.

BY

THE REV. ANSON WEST, D.D.,
Of the North Alabama Conference.

NASHVILLE, TENN.:
SOUTHERN METHODIST PUBLISHING HOUSE.
1885.

Entered, according to Act of Congress, in the year 1885,
By THE BOOK AGENTS OF THE METHODIST EPISCOPAL CHURCH, SOUTH,
in the Office of the Librarian of Congress, at Washington.

PREFACE.

THERE is a being called man. Whence is he? What is he? To propose these questions is to indicate somewhat the nature and capacity of the being concerning whom they are propounded. To inquire is one thing which distinguishes man among the various kinds of beings and sorts of things about him. The trees of the forest never ask questions, never search for the treasures of knowledge. In like manner, the beasts of the field, the fishes of the sea, the fowls of the air, never institute a search for knowledge. They never distinguish truth, they never review history. They are without experience, scheme, or skill. The heavens declare the glory of God, but have no glory of their own. The firmament shows the handiwork of the omniscient and omnipotent Jehovah, but displays no handiwork of its own. To inquire is wisdom; to doubt, in the presence of convincing testimony, is foolishness. To be indifferent to error is folly; to accept falsehood is criminal; to distinguish and hold the truth is legitimate and proper. To speak of that which is legitimate and that which is criminal is to introduce the moral realm, and present not only the intellectuality of man, but his moral nature and endowments. The subject enlarges, the view expands, and the field of inquiry fills the whole expanse between nonentity and divinity. When the questions, Whence is man? and what is he? recur, they suggest for consideration his relations, capacities, obligations, necessities, and destiny. His relations to the source of his being, to the law under which he exists, apostasy and redemption, life and death, immortality and annihilation, all crowd into view as subjects of profound interest. All teachers of religion are called upon to instruct in these things. The author of this book herein contributes what he can in the scope and space allowed.

The contents and purpose of this book are indicated by the title. Confining the discussion to the theme in hand, the subject is thoroughly and exhaustively presented. This book has not been written in haste, and it has not been written in any spirit of trifling. These pages indulge in no novelties. Truth, like God, is immutable. It never changes. What was true eighteen centuries ago is true now;

what was false then is false now. The Bible is complete, and no truth therein contained can be changed, modified, or annulled. All naturalists, geologists, astronomers, and philosophers should conform their theories to the teachings of the Bible. There is nothing in nature which, in any way, antagonizes the Bible. Profound convictions of the truth of the gospel, and an earnest desire to suppress the rising tide of heresies, and to contribute to the dissemination and maintenance of sound doctrine, have prompted in the writing of this book.

The author claims that in all its doctrines and utterances this book is evangelical, Arminian, Methodistic, and scriptural.

The following is the doctrine peculiar to the Calvinistic system: That God, by an absolute decree, elected to salvation a definite number of men, without any regard to their faith and obedience; and by the same decree excluded from saving grace, and reprobated to eternal damnation, all the rest of mankind, and that without regard to their impenitence and unbelief; that Jesus Christ did not make satisfaction for the sins of the whole race, but suffered death for the elect only; that God has, by his eternal and secret decree, foreordained whatsoever comes to pass, and put an unavoidable necessity on men to do, or not to do, whatsoever they do or do not, whether it be good or evil; that to the elect God gives grace, and they cannot reject it, and that to the reprobate he offers no grace, and they cannot accept it; that such as have received grace by faith can never fall from it finally or totally, notwithstanding the most enormous sins they can commit.

This Calvinistic doctrine is unhesitatingly and most emphatically rejected in these pages as unreasonable, and as unscriptural. To bind a man in eternal fate, and doom him without any reference to his moral character or conduct, is to reduce him to the level of a machine, and punish him without his incurring penalty. To redeem some and reprobate others, without any reference to moral conduct, is to act without a reason; to force grace upon some and withhold it from others is partiality. God does not act without a reason, and he is no respecter of persons.

Pelagians teach that holiness is right action, or the habit acquired by repeated virtuous actions; that holiness cannot be concreated with, or wrought into the nature of, a moral agent; and hence that Adam was not created holy, and that he was, when created, mortal, and would have died, though he had not sinned; that Adam was not the

federal head and legal representative of his race; that his sin was not imputed to his posterity; that all children are born into the world neither righteous nor sinful, without the taint or contagion of sin, without depravity or evil nature, without any bent or inclination to evil, and free from guilt and condemnation; that human nature is not to be disparaged; that the nature of every man as it comes into the world is the work and gift of God; that sin does not pass on to all men by natural descent, but by following or imitating Adam; that death and sufferings are not visited upon men here as penalty for sin, but only for correction and improvement; that regeneration is not a work wrought by God in the heart of the individual, changing it from a state of depravity to a state of holiness, but that regeneration is the work of the individual, and consists in gaining the habits of virtue by repeated good acts; that the death of Christ is not necessary to the forgiveness of sins, but only fit or expedient in the administration of the divine government; that Christ was only a man, and that his death was not vicarious nor expiatory, and that as a model of virtue he died simply as an example of duty and goodness to be imitated; that as an example his death is reforming, and that this is the only sense in which the word atonement can be attributed to his death; that his suffering is no satisfaction to justice or to the divine law; and that there is no divine wrath against sin to be appeased.

This whole Pelagian theory, which, crystallized into a complete system, takes in all the heresies of Arianism, Unitarianism, and Socinianism, is rejected, and, as the author fully believes, is completely refuted in this book.

Believing that this book contains the truth as it is revealed in the Holy Bible, and hoping that it will contribute to the extension of the kingdom of Christ among men, it is published and given to the reading public.

ANSON WEST.

HUNTSVILLE, ALABAMA, May 23, 1855.



CONTENTS.

CHAPTER I.—THE ORIGIN OF MAN.

Being—Eternity of being—Self-existence—The origin of things—God the Author and Maker of things—The days of creation—The cosmogony of Moses—Darwin—Hugh Miller—Geology.....9-23

CHAPTER II.—THE ORIGIN OF MAN.

Adam and Eve a pair, and the only pair created—All men have proceeded from Adam and Eve by propagation—Man has a body and a soul—Dichotomy—The soul—Preëxistence—Creation and infusion—Traduction.....24-37

CHAPTER III.—THE NATURAL AND MORAL STATE WHEREIN ADAM, THE FIRST MAN, WAS CREATED.

Man created in the image of God—Innocence—Guilt—Knowledge—Righteousness—Holiness—Obedience and holiness—Holiness a quality—Bellows—Bledsoe—Taylor—Immortality of man.....38-52

CHAPTER IV.—MAN'S FIRST TRANSGRESSION.

The Garden of Eden—The prohibition—The tree of knowledge of good and evil—The precept given in the prohibition—Adam's ability to keep the law, and to violate it—Positive and moral precepts—The account of the temptation of Adam history not allegory—Through what channel Adam and Eve were approached in the temptation—The existence of evil spirits.....53-64

CHAPTER V.—THE CONSEQUENCES OF THE FIRST TRANSGRESSION OF THE FIRST MAN.

Enactment of penalty against sin—Death a penalty—Definition of death—Effect of sin upon the human will, and upon human reason—One sin constitutes the sum of all guilt—Whether Adam suffered a privation of righteousness or an infusion of evil.....65-72

CHAPTER VI.—THE CONSEQUENCES OF THE FIRST TRANSGRESSION OF THE FIRST MAN.

Did the consequences of Adam's sin terminate on himself, or did they involve his posterity?—The theory of Pelagius—Dr. John Taylor—Dr. Bledsoe—Relation of Adam to his posterity—Adam's sin transmitted by generation—Adam's sin imputed to his posterity in legal administration.....73-81

CHAPTER VII.—THE CONSEQUENCES OF THE FIRST TRANSGRESSION OF THE FIRST MAN.

Objections to original sin—Objections to the terms used in setting forth the doctrine—Adam federal head and legal representative of his race—Original sin—Imputed sin—Individuality and communality—The distinction of original and personal sin—Eighteenth chapter of Ezekiel.....82-97

CHAPTER VIII.—THE CONSEQUENCES OF THE FIRST TRANSGRESSION OF THE FIRST MAN.

Infant damnation—The doctrine peculiarly Calvinistic—Infant salvation growing out of original sin—Atonement—Justification—Regeneration—Sinful Adam produces sinful progeny—The inability of infants, idiots, and lunatics—Prostration of the will—Relation of acts and dispositions—Matthew xviii. 3, and Mark x. 13-15—Sufferings inflicted a penalty for sin—No punishment where there is no guilt—Suffering and punishment inseparable—Romans vi. 6; Ephesians iv. 22; Colossians iii. 9, 10; 1 Corinthians ii. 14—Men sinners naturally and innately.....98-121

CHAPTER IX.—THE CONSEQUENCES OF THE FIRST TRANSGRESSION OF THE FIRST MAN.

Eternal death—Theories of Pelagians, Arians, Unitarians, and Universalists—Infinite sin, infinite wrath, infinite and eternal punishment—Sin *per se*—Obedience cannot abolish sin—Repentance cannot change the character of sin—Suffering cannot annul sin—The law cannot release from sin—God cannot do otherwise than punish sin—The wrath of God abides on sinners—The provision made for salvation—The theory of Universalists—Christ, the Son of God, took human nature, died to appease the wrath of God—Salvation suspended upon conditions, and involved in contingency—Texts bearing upon these points—Eternal punishment reasonable and just.....122-140

CHAPTER X.—GOD, WITHOUT WHOM, AND IN THE REJECTION OF WHOM,
THERE IS NO SALVATION.

The being and perfections of God—All principles, rights, obligations, and government depend on the existence of God—God not self-created, but self-existent—Essence of God—Not the universe—His essence not imparted to any thing—He is in essence a Spirit—One God over all things—He is immutable—In his administration he changes—He is ubiquitous—He is the Almighty—He knows all things—His omniscience—His holiness—His justice—His goodness—His triunity—The relation of the three persons in the Godhead—The Son, God, eternal in essence and person—Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, terms designating and distinguishing the persons in the Trinity, and do not express acts by which the relations of the divine persons originated—The Holy Ghost, God, eternal in essence and person—The divine essence is not communicable—Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, all self-existent—Jesus Christ, the Son of God, the Son of man, the God-man—Creation—Eternal generation—Eternal procession—Self-existence—Union of the two natures.....141-180

CHAPTER XI.—REDEMPTION.

Jesus—Saviour and Redeemer—Jesus died as no man ever died—The Lamb of God—The word "redeem"—Christ's sufferings penal—Jesus died not for his own sins, but for sins of others—His death expiatory and substitutional—Punitive justice, vicarious suffering, and sacrificial expiation of guilt—Taylor—Sykes—Bledsoe—Bellows—Administrative and retributive justice—Christ a Redeemer in all ages—Dr. Carpenter—Nothing like satisfaction and substitution—The cases of Zuleucus and the teacher Alcott—Redemption removed from all illustration and comparison—The expiation finished—Salvation not consummated on the cross—The atonement made for all the race—The atonement sufficient—Christ did not keep the precepts of the law in the place of any one—He did not abolish the law—Every Christian under obligation to obey the law—Salvation offered upon conditions—The word of God upon the limit and application of the atonement—The results contingent.....181-242

CHAPTER XII.—JUSTIFICATION.

Justification defined—God only can forgive sins—Sins forgiven for the merit of Jesus—The forgiveness of sins the same in all generations—The condition upon which justification is attained—Repentance—Immersion—Baptism—Imputation of Christ's righteousness and obedience—Faith—Paul and James.....243-258

CHAPTER XIII.—REGENERATION.

Generation and regeneration—All men need regeneration—Regeneration defined and described—All men recipients of prevenient grace—The Holy Ghost alone can change the heart—The testimony of the Holy Spirit—Sanctification—Holiness.....259-281

CHAPTER XIV.—THE SACRAMENTS OF THE CHURCH—BAPTISM AND
THE LORD'S SUPPER.

The Church originated with God in the scheme of redemption—Set up in the covenant made with the apostate Adam—Baptism—The character and purpose of baptism—The terms used in designating baptism—No specific mode prescribed—Baptism should be properly estimated—Who are entitled to baptism?—The baptism of infants—The Lord's Supper—It is a sacrament—Transubstantiation—Consubstantiation—Who are entitled to the Lord's Supper?.....282-317

CHAPTER XV.—THE PERSONAL CHRISTIAN LIFE TERMINATING IN
THE FINAL REWARDS OF SALVATION.

Life a probation—Revelation—The Bible supernatural—The divinity of the Bible attested—Things pertaining to the Christian within the realm of the supernatural, the invisible, and the future—Faith—Hope saves—Final salvation of the Christian contingent—Final glorification.....318-335

THE OLD AND THE NEW MAN.



CHAPTER I.

THE ORIGIN OF MAN.

BEING is a fact, and the first of all facts. There is real existence, absolute being, the doubts and denials thereof to the contrary notwithstanding. There is a tangible and visible world. Being is the basis of being. Existence, or being, has back of it, as great underlying ideas, preëxistence from eternity and self-existence. There can be no proper conception of being and the origin of being without these ideas. The eternity of being is one thing, while the eternity of matter is quite another. This distinction should be carefully considered and clearly comprehended. Eternity of matter does not essentially underlie existence, and utterly fails to account for the origin of being; while eternity of being, or preëxistence from eternity, is essentially inseparable from existence. Being necessarily involves the eternity of being, but not the eternity of mere matter. Could the eternity of matter be established beyond a peradventure, this would account only for the existence of matter, and would in nowise account for the existence of the world as it is with mind and spirit and life and thought. It is unnecessary to elaborate this thought in this connection. It is not within the power of any thing to produce or impart that which it does not possess, and it is, therefore, impossible for nouentity to give birth to something. Matter does not possess life, spirit, mind, thought,

action, and therefore does not and cannot impart these. Nonentity cannot produce something. There is something in existence, therefore something has always existed.

Self-existence also is involved in being, for it is manifest from the above conclusions that in the absence of a being with inherent existence, independent of any other cause than that in itself, there never could be any substance or any thing constituting existence.

These truths, therefore, may lead us to look for the origin and cause of being, and with the light of revelation shining upon the subject we can at once find the being possessing the characteristics of essential and independent existence—the very author of being—the cause and originator of all other beings and things. God, Jehovah, are his names. He announces himself, “I AM THAT I AM.” It is said of him: “Before the mountains were brought forth, or ever thou hadst formed the earth and the world, even from everlasting to everlasting, thou art God.” He is “the high and lofty one that inhabiteth eternity, whose name is Holy.”

God—the self-existent, independent, eternal, and ever-living God—is the author of being, the cause of existence. He made all things. He not only formed, combined, and adjusted materials and things, but he created the very elements, or essence, of things. He created the things that are out of nothing. “The worlds were framed by the word of God, so that things which are seen were not made of things which do appear.” “By him were all things created that are in heaven, and that are in earth, visible and invisible, whether they be thrones, or dominions, or principalities, or powers; all things were created by him, and for him; and he is before all things, and by him all things consist.” There were no chaotic elements out of which the Lord made the worlds, but by his own word he spoke out of nonentity the

things that be. The production of the first elements of being, and the framing and forming of the whole into the world as it is, was but one act of creation. The theory of development, either by natural laws or stages of formations, is repugnant to the doctrine of Scripture, and obnoxious to many objections from a philosophical stand-point. The first declaration of Moses is: "In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth." This includes the entire of the heavens and the earth, and presents the creation of the whole as one act, and as taking place at one time in the beginning. Moses further teaches that the whole work of creation was completed in six literal days of twenty-four hours each.

The view that the world came into existence as a divine production, out of nothing, made and completed in six literal days, has been and is rejected by scientists so called. However these scientists who reject this view may differ in the terms they use, and the line of argument they pursue, and whatever the shades of difference in their theories, they all come to the same end, and harmonize in the same general system. Instead of the above view, these scientists teach that the universe is a growth, the result of a series of changes which have been going on from an incalculable period in antiquity. The earth, they contend, with its continents and oceans, etc., is the result of numerous deposits and transformations, and under the principles of progress, and in multiplied forms, life has been reproducing creatures for innumerable millions of years, and in each evolution reaching a higher order of life and being. Rejecting the supernatural in the production of things, they claim that through some original force the universe has reached its present form and condition by a gradual growth. This is the theory with which the doctrine of a proper creation by a divine Creator, and the chronology of the Bible which,

in its literal interpretation, fixes the creation of the world at a definite period, and in the short time of six literal days, are sought to be supplanted.

Spencer, Darwin, and Hugh Miller, with other infidels, have expended no little labor in the endeavor to show that the Bible idea of creation, as to nature and time, is false. They have sought to fix an epoch at which certain strata, coals, rocks, minerals, mammals, and other deposits, had no existence—an epoch at which there was nothing but nebulae or atoms or vapor; and they have talked learnedly about segregation, disintegration, concentration, condensation, disaggregation, and attraction, until they have evolved and developed the world as it is!

Some may object to our classing Hugh Miller with infidel scientists. It is true he professed to believe the Bible but the theory which he has put forth in the name of the science of geology, and under the title, "Testimony of the Rocks," is as antagonistic to the Bible, and as destructive of its divine teachings, as the theories of Spencer and Darwin put forth in the name of general science with the titles, "Social Statics," "First Principles," "Principles of Biology," "Descent of Man," etc. His groupings of rocks and coals, of minerals and mammals, and of shells and bones, for proving development in the production and formation of the world, are just as objectionable and atheistical as Mr. Spencer's and Mr. Darwin's speculations about the "Survival of the Fittest" and "Natural Selection" to prove evolution and development. Mr. Miller teaches that animals and plants existed many thousands of years before man existed, and that the earth existed many thousands of years before animals and plants. He teaches "that untold ages ere man had sinned or suffered, the animal creation exhibited exactly its present state of war." He teaches that long before "man appeared in creation, and darkened

its sympathetic face with the stain of moral guilt, the reign of violence and outrage" began, and "that there was death among the inferior creatures and suffering." Thus he joins other infidels in rejecting the Mosaic account of the creation of the world, and the introduction of death and suffering.

But let us look at the theory of these scientists. There are more fictions and assumptions in their theory than facts and science. There is not a fact in science which is in conflict with the doctrine of a proper creation, nor with the doctrine of the creation of the world in all its parts and as a whole in six literal days of twenty-four hours each. Again, this theory of these infidel scientists is not a thing of yesterday. It is not the discovery of the present century, as some would boast, brought out under the increased light of recent scientific discovery. Not at all. In its main points and general principles it is as old as philosophy, falsely so called—as old as infidelity.

In the very first centuries of the Christian era, and even before, there were those who rejected the cosmogony of Moses. Celsus, who, I believe, wrote in the second century of the Christian era, "cast discredit upon the Mosaic account of creation, and intimated his agreement with those who held that the world is uncreated." Again he, "expressing in a single word his opinion regarding the Mosaic cosmogony, finds fault with it, saying: 'Moreover, their cosmogony is extremely silly.'" In another place he says: "By far the most silly thing is the distribution of the creation of the world over certain days, before days existed; for, as the heaven was not yet created, nor the foundation of the earth yet laid, nor the sun yet revolving, how could there be days?" This we gather from Origen, who, in the third century, wrote against Celsus. These are just such attacks as are still made in the nineteenth century upon the account of creation recorded in the book of Genesis.

In the third and fourth centuries there were those who condemned the Mosaic history and chronology which set forth the world as a creation, and fix the time of its creation at four thousand years before Christ. Augustine, speaking of these men, says: "They are deceived, too, by those highly mendacious documents which profess to give the history of many thousand years, though, reckoning by the sacred writings, we find that not six thousand years have yet passed." Augustine wrote some of his works in the beginning of the fifth century. In these early centuries we find the Christians of sound orthodoxy defending themselves and the account of creation against the very same attacks that are being made now; they defend a proper creation out of nothing in the beginning in six literal days, four thousand years before Christ. It is, therefore, deceptive, false, and pernicious to assume that the doctrine that the world did not have its origin in a proper creation in six literal days, but in a growth or development of indefinite periods, reaching back millions of ages into eternity, is the discovery of the present age, made by the light of increased scientific knowledge, the product of an era of advanced thought.

Philosophers and scientists, so called, often kiss religion in order to gain an opportunity of more effectually smiting it. Their declarations concerning religion, and their concessions to it, are often most wonderful indeed, as a few examples will show.

On page 18 of his "Evolution-Philosophy," Cazelles says: "Science is no longer a rival of religion." On page 72 he says: "There are, then, but two methods fundamentally and essentially opposed—the theological and the positive." And yet on another page he declares: "Religion ought to renew its symbols in accordance with the developments of science." From this stand-point he also

utters the following: "Religion, then, is legitimate, and science is indispensable." What concessions these to religion! Science is not only legitimate, it is indispensable! Religion is not indispensable in any view! It is legitimate if it will renew its symbols and change its dogmas so as to bring itself into harmony with science! Then, and only then, will it be true, we suppose, that "science is no longer the rival of religion!"

Mr. Hugh Miller makes about the same insulting concessions to religion while giving what is his proposed scheme of reconciliation of the Mosaic and geologic records. In his work, "Testimony of the Rocks," at page 194, he writes: "In what light, or on what principle, shall we most correctly read the prophetic drama of creation? In the light, I reply, of scientific discovery—on the principle that the clear and certain must be accepted, when attainable, as the proper exponents of the doubtful and obscure." According to Mr. Miller, the discoveries of science have made things clear and certain; the Mosaic record is doubtful and obscure! Surely, with this scheme of reconciliation in force, "science is no longer a rival of religion." The truth is, the theories and speculations of geologists and other scientists are most generally in conflict with and in opposition to religion. But it is true also that the religion of the Bible is not and never was in opposition to nature, or in conflict with it. There is no rivalry between the Bible and nature. The Bible, having, as has been said, "God for its author, truth without any mixture of error for its matter, and the salvation of man for its end," is the clearest and best book given to man, and nothing which it reveals or teaches is in conflict with the laws and facts and truths of nature. With implicit confidence we accept whatever is clear, certain, and true in nature. The true in science we admire and love, but whatever sets itself in conflict with

the Bible and its plain interpretations, under whatever titles it may claim favor, we scout and condemn as unphilosophical and vain.

Geologists have indulged in more speculations, vain and delusive, than any class of men, perhaps, known to our age. Most of what is written by them is founded in mere assumptions. Even their facts, many of them, are no facts at all. We should not give place to their delusions for a moment. After all their researches and discoveries, what do we know of the earth? One of the very best geologists and most trustworthy authors among them says: "The highest mountains do not rise five miles above the level of the sea, and the deepest mines descend only about a third part of a mile, so that even were we perfectly acquainted with the entire space between the tops of the highest mountain and the bottom of the deepest mine, it would form but a very insignificant fraction of the distance between the surface and center of the globe, which is nearly four thousand miles." ("Elements of Geology," by Page, p. 1.)

Having penetrated the earth no deeper than here indicated, and having so little knowledge of even that which we have seen, we have not, from this source, the first elements upon which to build a sound and reliable scheme of doctrine. The whole theory founded by geologists upon what they claim as the indications of this science as to the process of the formation of the globe, and the age of the world, is utterly absurd and absolutely untenable. The resort to learned technicalities and labored classifications in naming and arranging the materials and compositions of the globe for indicating the stages of the earth's growth up to its present condition, is so utterly futile it is wonderful that men claiming the study of science as their occupation should be guilty of such. The learned parade made over the relations and positions of strata, minerals, metals, rocks,

sands, and soils, so far as any thing to be proved by these is concerned, is the emptiest nonsense engaging human attention. The least reflection will lead to the conclusion that the existence and relations and positions of strata, minerals, metals, rocks, sands, and soils, do not reveal any thing pertaining to the growth and age of the world. Is it true that the granite is found under the old red sandstone, and the oolite limestone above it, and the alluvial clay, sand, and gravel still above that? If so, something else than the law of evolution must account for it; something else than age and process of formation had to do with the positions and relations of these. Are rocks found in one position in one section and in another position in another range? Are metals and minerals found in one part of the continent and not in another? in one part of a State and not in another part of it? Something else than the growth of the globe and the age of the world must account for the facts so discovered. When the gneiss was made, so were the alluvial clay, sand, gravel, and the vegetable soils. Granite, lime, clay, coal, vegetables, gold, silver, copper, iron, and all the rest, were made at once, when God laid the foundations of the earth and made the dust of the highest hills. These are elements, and combinations of elements, which composed and constituted in part the earth as it was made by God, and not as it grew of itself. God made and laid the elements in their places originally. Floods and convulsions have torn and upheaved many of them since the creation, but still they are the product of the Divine hand, dating back in their origin to the beginning.

Whatever formations may take place in the present state of things, the effect could not be the same in the condition which the evolutionists claim for the world in its first stages of existence, in what they claim as its first deposits—in its first atoms. It is said: "The atmosphere, which everywhere

surrounds the globe, is either of itself the immediate cause of numerous terrestrial changes, or it is the medium through which they are effected." Again, it is said: "The planetary relations of the globe exert a permanent and, it may be, sometimes a temporary and peculiar influence on the changes which have been effected, or are now going forward on its surface." ("Elements of Geology," by Page, pp. 31, 32.) How, then, could there be any idea formed of the process going on when these things, the globe, the atmosphere, and the planets, did not exist, drawn from what goes on, now that they do exist, under their influence?

The finding and parading of the foot-prints of birds and animals in coals and sands and rocks, as evidence of evolution, is about equal to a child sitting and imagining the clouds turning into horses and chariots, landscapes and mansions.

Even upon the supposition that the earth has developed its strata, and grown from the smallest original deposits or atoms to its present form and size, how did the sun and moon and stars come into being? Is there any thing in what is claimed as the geological manifestations of the earth which can account for the existence of the sun, moon, and stars? What geologists would answer to this question we cannot tell. Mr. Hugh Miller, however, says this much: "Of the period during which the two great lights of the earth, with the other heavenly bodies, became visible from the earth's surface, we need expect to find no record in the rocks." He seems to hold to the idea that the sun and moon and other heavenly bodies existed previous to the fourth day, or what he calls a period, but were concealed, and were simply manifested, not made, on the fourth day. But if the rocks contain no record on the subject, what can he know about it?

It is sometimes asked, "How did the light exist before

the fourth day, when the sun was made?" We ask, How did the world, on the principles of evolution, evolve and develop without light and without the sun? And there is the same difficulty in accounting for the existence of light on the theory of lengthened periods without the sun that there is on the theory of literal days. We know that light was created on the first day and the sun was created on the fourth day. So light did exist, as distinguished from darkness, three days before the sun was made. The same method of accounting for the existence of light from the first to the fourth period without the sun, will suffice to account for its existence from the first to the fourth literal day without the sun.

That Moses means literal days, and not something else, by the six days mentioned in connection with creation, can be established by a sound interpretation and definition of the history he gives and the language he uses. In the first place, he gives a literal history of the creation. It is no panoramic view which he exhibits. It is held by more than one author that the Mosaic account of creation can be reconciled with the facts of science only by regarding it as a record of *appearances*. Mr. Hugh Miller maintains this, and that the revelation made to Moses concerning the heavens and the earth, and by him recorded in the first chapter of Genesis, was not conveyed "as a piece of narrative dictated" to him, but that it was "conveyed by a succession of sublime visions." And he calls it, all along, "The Mosaic vision of creation," "The Mosaic drama of creation." Insanity and suicide are fit endings to such sacrilegious treatment of the divine record. It was no mere drama, no mere vision. God did in reality reveal and dictate by inspiration to Moses the record which he makes of creation. The record has all the elements of a real history, narrating the real fact and occurrence of creation. If the account

of creation here given is nothing but the vagaries of a vision, the panoramic paintings of a drama, so we may say of the accounts of the flood, the call of Abraham, the bondage of Israel in Egypt, the crossing of the Red Sea, the journeyings and transactions in the wilderness, and all the rest.

The only legitimate interpretation of the language and terms used in connection with the subject of creation by Moses justifies the conclusion that he means literal days. The "beginning," referring to time as distinguished from eternity; the "darkness" distinguished from "light," and called "night;" "light" distinguished from "darkness," and called "day;" the "evening and the morning," distinguished as the "first day" and the "second day," etc., all, singly and in the whole, bear us down to the one conclusion—all reveal and designate literal days of twenty-four hours each, days marked by the diurnal revolutions of the earth. There was nothing which pointed to any other motions, revolutions, or agencies, as producing, measuring, and dividing time and days, but those that produce, measure, and divide days such as we now understand by days of twenty-four hours. There were no revolutions of the earth to mark indefinite periods of time. There are none such now, and there is no evidence that any such ever existed. And as no such revolutions ever existed in the universe, it is the sum of all folly to think and talk of such days or periods being meant by the inspired historian. It is evident that at the first, or beginning, there was that which marked and divided the literal day, just as there is now, and as there was in the time of Moses. Nothing in contravention of this idea can be found either in the divine revelation or the works of nature.

There are some places in the Scriptures where the term "day" designates "time" in the sense of seasons or occa-

sions, and it is quite extensive in its reference; but there are many other places where the term "day" is definite, naming a literal day, and where it can have no other reference. Leviticus xxiii. 32, 34 may be given as an example: "It shall be unto you a Sabbath of rest, and ye shall afflict your souls; in the ninth day of the month at even, from even unto even, shall ye celebrate your Sabbath. . . . The fifteenth day of this seventh month shall be the feast of tabernacles for seven days unto the Lord."

The argument upon the question of literal days is not complete without a reference to the history and institution of the Sabbath-day. One thing is beyond question: If the Decalogue means literal days where it enjoins, "Six days shalt thou labor, and do all thy work; but the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God; in it thou shalt not do any work," then it means literal days when it says: "For in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is, and rested the seventh day; wherefore the Lord blessed the Sabbath-day, and hallowed it." The Church of God has understood from the time of the creation that the Sabbath-day is a literal day—that the week is made up of seven literal days. Why enjoin the observance of one literal day in seven as a Sabbath, and enforce it with a declaration that God made the heaven and the earth in six indefinite periods? What force could it have? What connection would there be in the two? None whatever. Moses, in the second chapter of Genesis, using the term "day" in the identical sense which he attaches to it in the first chapter, and still speaking of the work of creation, says: "And on the seventh day God ended his work which he had made; and he rested on the seventh day from all his work which he had made. And God blessed the seventh day, and sanctified it; because that in it he had rested from all his work which God created and

made." And then in the other books of the Pentateuch, and at different places, Moses says: "In six days the Lord made heaven and earth, and on the seventh day he rested." The whole question is here settled upon the authority of the Scriptures themselves. So long as one day in seven is retained and observed in the Church of God as a holy day of rest, so long will the creation of the world in six days by God be kept sacredly before the minds of men. So long as the holy Sabbath here carries the mind forward to a coming rest of consummated bliss in the presence of God, so long will it carry the mind back to the time of its sacred origin when the hand of God completed the work of creation, and rested on the seventh day of time.

It is no uncommon thing for those who advocate the speculations of geologists to assert that he who rejects these theories of theirs and maintains the doctrine of literal days, and a chronology of four thousand years from the creation to the birth of Christ, sacrifices thereby whatever reputation for knowledge he has, and that, justly deserving the contempt of all intelligent people, he should be expelled from literary and scientific circles, and consigned to oblivion. But it appears to us that he who is engaged in teaching these scriptural doctrines of literal days, and a definite chronology, is as worthy of consideration and is in proximity to as many avenues of light as the scientist whose sole performance "is to resolve abstractions into one another." And it is not altogether unnecessary to remind scientific gentlemen of the fact that the Church of God does at this very hour set forth in all her literature and standard theology the doctrine that the world was created in six literal days four thousand years before the birth of Christ. She is settled and fixed upon these points. She has never yet thought of convening a council for the purpose of changing her standards or revoking her teachings upon these doc-

trines. She comes before the world with her standards containing one uniform system upon these points. All, from her catechisms in which she teaches the children committed to her care up to the huge volumes of systematic divinity, avow the simple doctrine of creation in six literal days, and the date of the creation at four thousand years before Christ.

It is a little ludicrous to see men assuming to be scientific and arrogating to themselves such wisdom as to ridicule the Church of God for ignorance. With the poet we ask:

What is philosophy, if it impart
Irreverence for the Deity, or teach
A mortal man to set his judgment up
Against his Maker's will?

The chronology of the Bible establishes beyond all question the period of four thousand years as the length of time from the creation to the advent of Christ. It gives the creation of Adam at the beginning of time on the sixth day, and then from Adam traces the generations, giving the exact number of years of each on down to Noah, and from Noah to Abraham, and from Abraham on to David, and on to Christ, and from Christ back through these generations to Adam and to God, as Adam was the created son of God.

That God could create this magnificent and complicated world in six days gives us a conception of the grandeur of his power and the comprehension and vastness of his wisdom. We may rejoice in his testimony when he says: "I have made the earth, and created man upon it; I, even my hands, have stretched out the heavens, and all their host have I commanded." The whole universe is a creation by God, not an emanation from God.

CHAPTER II.

THE ORIGIN OF MAN.

GOD in the beginning created man; male and female created he them. He created Adam and Eve, a single pair. From these two have proceeded all the race. From Adam have sprung all the nations of men that dwell on the earth. God did not create a plurality of races of men. He did not continue creating, but, making a single pair in the beginning, he ceased from the specific work of creating; and this pair, Adam and Eve, propagated their race which was seminally in them. Every thing in the works of God which has life of any sort in it has the power of propagating its kind under certain laws which God has prescribed. Plants and trees, animals, fishes, and fowls, all have a sort of life inherently pertaining to them, and they all propagate and perpetuate their kind. Not that they evolve out of themselves a higher order of being and of life, but they each propagate and perpetuate their own kind upon the same scale of being which they had in the beginning.

This is manifestly true of man. When God made man he made him male and female, and said unto them: "Be fruitful, and multiply, and replenish the earth, and subdue it." This injunction was imposed in view of man's capacity to comply with it; or, if you will call it a permission instead of an injunction, it was given in the same view of the ease, and with reference to his capacity to enjoy it. The observation of every generation attests that the law of propagation is the law of man's being, and that herein are found

the mode and manner of the perpetuation and multiplication of his race. By the law of procreation every individual of every nation and of every generation has proceeded from Adam, the first man. That all men have descended by propagation from Adam and Eve is attested by the text: "Adam called his wife's name Eve, because she was the mother of all living." Adam is so named not only because he is from and of the earth, but he is so called as man, the head and progenitor of the race. He is also called in the Scriptures "the first man," as the one from whom all other men have proceeded. "Man" is a term used also in referring to the whole race, including Adam and his posterity. In the book of Deuteronomy is found this language: "Since the day that God created man upon the earth," as a general reference to man in his succeeding generations from Adam, and to the fact that in Adam God created man—all men who live on the earth in their succeeding generations. "And as I may so say, Levi also, who receiveth tithes, paid tithes in Abraham. For he was yet in the loins of his father when Melchizedek met him." So we may say all the generations of men were in the loins of their father Adam when he was made. God "hath made of one blood all nations of men for to dwell on all the face of the earth." All men, since Adam, have come into being in their individual existence by propagation, and not otherwise.

This has not, however, been conceded by all theologians in the past, so far as the soul is concerned. Christian writers of by-gone ages have maintained different and conflicting theories upon the origin of the soul of man. The preëxistence of the soul, the creation and infusion of the soul at the time of birth, and the traduction of the soul with the body, have, as points of doctrine, all had their advocates; and these points of doctrine have served some particular purpose in the peculiar creed of their several advocates.

Man has a body, and he has a soul, but whether in these we have all the constituent natures of man has been questioned. Some, in discoursing upon man, have maintained the theory of trichotomy, insisting that man has a body, a soul, and a spirit, and that there are certain passages of Scripture which are inexplicable upon any other hypothesis. The principal passages adduced in favor of this hypothesis are the following: "And I pray God your whole spirit and soul and body be preserved blameless unto the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ." (1 Thess. v. 23.) "For the word of God is quick, and powerful, and sharper than any two-edged sword, piercing even to the dividing asunder of soul and spirit, and of the joints and marrow, and is a discerner of the thoughts and intents of the heart." (Heb. iv. 12.)

One author, the Rev. J. B. Heard, commenting upon this last passage, says: "That which the marrow is to the joints, that the spirit is to the soul. As marrow is flesh within flesh, so the spirit is a soul within the soul. . . . Any sword will pierce the soul, but it is only the sword of the Spirit that can pierce and divide between soul and spirit." This is an invention of Mr. Heard, and by no means an idea of the scripture before us. It is not true that any sword will pierce the soul. A sword made of steel cannot pierce the soul, though it might pierce and wound the body. It is not too much to say that we think these passages here taken from the First Epistle to the Thessalonians, and from the Epistle to the Hebrews, can be explicated on the hypothesis of dichotomy. Dichotomy is the doctrine everywhere taught in the Scriptures. We may linger here long enough to remark that in the text taken from the Epistle to the Thessalonians the apostle means to include the whole man, and he does include him in his entirety, naming spirit, soul, and body, about as we would include him in his indi-

viduality and entirety in naming him in his intellectual, moral, and physical being. We would never think that we were teaching trichotomy when naming together the intellectual, moral, and physical faculties and capabilities of man. It is the purpose of the text taken from Hebrews to show the power and office of the word of God in detecting the most secret thoughts, intentions, and desires of the man. This, and nothing more.

In the tenth chapter of Luke is found this text: "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy strength, and with all thy mind; and thy neighbor as thyself." Analyzing this text, and interpreting it upon the principles adopted by trichotomists, it would as clearly substantiate tetrachotomy as do the texts from Thessalonians and Hebrews trichotomy. If these teach a threefold nature in man, this teaches at least a fourfold nature. Here is heart, soul, strength, and mind. And it is intended to express the fact that the man in his entire capabilities should be engaged in the love and service of God. The desires of the heart, the affections of the soul, the strength of the body, and thoughts and reflections of the mind, are all comprehended in the injunctions of this text. Heart, soul, and mind are terms somewhat synonymous, and are so used in the Scriptures in different places, though they are all used here in this particular instance, and perhaps with a difference of signification. If this text does not teach tetrachotomy, no more do the passages from Thessalonians and Hebrews constitute a basis upon which to build such a fabric as the tripartite doctrine.

Dichotomy, we repeat, is the doctrine taught by the Scriptures. "And the Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and man became a living soul." (Gen. ii. 7.) Here are agent and material, action and result. By God, out of

the dust of the ground, a body is formed; by God, through the act of breathing, life is imparted, a soul is made, and there is a living being, having a body and a soul. This man is not an emanation from God, but a creature made by God—the corporeal body out of the dust of the ground, the incorporeal soul out of nothing. The constituent natures of man are presented in a striking manner in the following scripture: “And fear not them which kill the body, but are not able to kill the soul; but rather fear him which is able to destroy both soul and body in hell.” (Matt. x. 28.) Every creature is simply corporeal, or simply spiritual, or composed of the two essences, matter and spirit. Trees consist purely of matter; angels, purely of spirit; and man consists of matter and spirit. Matter and spirit may unite, but cannot mix, and between the two there is no mean; and so man cannot be possessed of more than a body and a soul. The Rev. J. B. Heard teaches that the nature of man’s soul is found “midway between matter and spirit.” This is too absurd to merit refutation.

The refutation of trichotomy may be found in its own contradictions and absurdities, and therefore we will exhibit here a few of these. Heard, in his “Tripartite Nature of Man,” from which we have already quoted, says: “The soul, which we may here provisionally describe as the *ego*, or the *nexus*, between matter and mind, is the meeting point between the higher and the lower natures in man. . . . It [the Bible] lays down for our instruction the two natures of man—the animal and the spiritual—and then describes *nephesh* as the union point between the two. Man became a living soul in the sense that his *nephesh*, or self, is the meeting point, or *tertium quid*, of these two natures, body and spirit.” (Pages 47, 48.) This is so unphilosophical and so unscriptural that it appears strange to us that any intelligent mind could consent to avow it and send

it forth in permanent form. The Bible nowhere speaks of the soul as a third something between matter and mind—nowhere speaks of the soul as the union point between the two different and contrary natures. Matter and spirit cannot be so mixed, or intermingled, or bound together, as to make a distinct or additional nature in man, or in any other being. The material and the immaterial—the body and the spirit—may be so united as to constitute being, as to constitute individuality. We may say these united constitute one person, but they cannot be so united as to constitute a third and distinct nature. The Bible does present man as a living being, as a living soul in his entirety, but nowhere presents the idea of matter and spirit mixing and mingling and forming a third nature, as oxygen and hydrogen gases unite and form water.

And again Mr. Heard writes: “We have seen from Scripture that the distinction between body, soul, and spirit is real, and not verbal only.” (Page 115.) “The trichotomy is three natures in one person.” (Page 120.) “Man has three natures in one person.” (Page 138.) The distinction, he insists, between body, soul, and spirit, is real, so much so that there are three natures in man, and yet this same author has written the following sentence: “The trichotomy of Scripture does not, then, imply the union of three separable and distinct natures in man.” (Page 118.) Here, then, he contradicts himself. On one page he says there are three natures in man, and that this is the doctrine of Scripture; on another page he says there are not three natures in man, and that this is the doctrine of Scripture. But hear him again on another point: “As God is a Spirit, so the spirit in man is that which, in an eminent and peculiar sense, comes from God. God, as we shall see in discussing the question of creationism, is the creator *ex traduce* of the animal and intellectual part of every man naturally born into

the world. Not so with the spirit, it comes from God, and is of God. Let us not shrink from using the expression that it proceeds from God, not by creation, but by emanation. But the spirit in man is divine, consubstantial with God, who is the Father of spirits, as our bodies of flesh are consubstantial with those of the parents of our flesh." (Page 103.) This is the theology founded upon trichotomy. Here it is said the spirit comes from God, is consubstantial with God, is divine, is, in a word, God. Bearing this in mind, let us look at what he says further about this pneuma, or spirit: "Thus we identify conscience with the remains of the pneuma in fallen man." (Page 159.) Having already said that the spirit in man is God, here he says the spirit in man is conscience. The Apostle Paul, in writing to his son Timothy, speaks of some "having their conscience seared with a hot iron." Now put these together. The spirit is conscience, and the spirit is God, and the conscience is God. The conscience in some is seared. Therefore, when the conscience is seared, God is seared!

But let us follow this author a little farther, still keeping in mind that he says that the spirit in man is divine—is God. Again he writes: "The mystery of human nature seems to lie in this, that men are born into the world with a living body and soul, but with a dead, or dormant, spirit." (Page 201.) "The pneuma in the unregenerate man is, as we have seen before, a dead, or dormant, capacity." (Page 203.) This spirit, he here says, is dead, or dormant. He has said this spirit is divine, is God. So, according to this trichotomist, God is dormant, God is dead! Alas for this man's system! He has sought for a psychology consistent with a proper theology, and he has found it in a system which involves the sacrilegious idea that God is dead!

But let us hear him once more: "When a man's spirit is acted upon by the quickening Spirit, and is really regen-

erated by the Holy Ghost," etc. (Page 206.) "But the awakened conscience, the spirit, or pneuma, as we must now call it, so soon as it is quickened by the Holy Ghost, will not palter with itself any longer." (Page 208.) "Regeneration, then, is the quickening of this pneuma, and sanctification is the carrying on of that which conversion began." (Page 218.) So this pneuma, or spirit, is conscience, and is God; and thus pneuma, or God, is quickened and regenerated, and is quickened and regenerated by the Holy Ghost. So God is quickened, awakened, and regenerated by God! These are some of the absurdities of trichotomy, and are enough to refute and forever condemn the theory. Here we dismiss trichotomy, feeling assured that the Bible is clearly against it, and in favor of dichotomy.

Various, long, and labored have been the efforts to prove man complete without a soul. Systems of philosophy, replete with learned phraseology, have been invented and adopted to portray man to himself entire without a soul. Hylozoism and Materialism, with other like theories, have been brought into requisition, with their speculations about organic life, laws of association and vibration, to account for man's nature, capabilities, and achievements without allowing him a soul. But none of these systems and inventions can answer the purpose for which they have been brought forward. They are utterly futile in this behalf. Until philosophers can compute the number of inches or of pounds in a thought, and reckon the longitude and latitude of an affection, and locate the geography of a desire, none of their speculations will suffice to account for the achievements of man on the hypothesis that he has no soul. Man is heterogeneous as well as homogeneous. It is as manifestly true that man has a soul which reasons and loves as it is that he has a body which can be handled, measured, and weighed. The Bible has taught us the science of hu-

man nature, and everywhere, by assumption, concession, implication, declaration, and precept, teaches that man has a soul, though invisible, yet real, immortal, and eternal. It is unnecessary to accumulate here a list of texts in proof of the existence of the human soul. It would be rather difficult to find a place in the sacred record where the doctrine is not prominently presented. Stephen, when dying, said, "Lord Jesus, receive my spirit." The rich man and Lazarus, in their souls, when dead, went each to a place of abode, and one was happy and the other tormented.

The question of the origin of the soul is now before us, and must claim our consideration. The preëxistence of the soul has entered into the discussions which have engaged attention in connection with the question of its origin. It has been said by different authors, and by those who ought to know, that Origen, who wrote in the third century, taught "that the souls of men had existed in a previous state, and that their imprisonment in material bodies was a punishment for sins which they had then committed." It is in his *De Principiis* that he is said to have taught this doctrine. In the English version which we have of this work we do not find this doctrine taught in any tangible form; at least, we find nothing which we could not explain upon a different hypothesis. It is said, however, that the Greek text of most of this work has perished, and that the Latin version of it, which is a translation by Rufinus, a great admirer of Origen, is not reliable, as Rufinus altered many of Origen's expressions. But this doctrine of the preëxistence of souls is not tenable from a Christian standpoint. It is allied to the superstitious notions of heathens and idolaters. It is akin to the Buddhist notions of metempsychosis. The idea of a wandering exile vagrancy is the underlying idea of this theory of preëxistence. It cannot be consonant with reason for a soul existing from be-

fore the beginning of creation to enter into a body of yesterday. A soul made and existing in a personal entity, having no kindred relation to any other being, cannot be in essence or otherwise allied to the human race—cannot be in any way related to the human family, or implicated in their destiny. Such a thought is the climax of all folly.

Creationism, a doctrine which teaches that by a distinct and special act God creates and infuses the soul into the body at the time of birth, is obnoxious to the same objections which lie against the doctrine of the preëxistence of the soul. Who first advocated this doctrine is to us unknown. Dr. Shedd, after telling us, in his "History of Christian Doctrine," that this theory was held in the patristic period, states that it "was the dominant one in the Eastern Church, and found advocates in the Western." He also says Jerome in his day remarked "that creationism is the true Church doctrine." Again, he says that "Hilary of Pictavium is the most explicit advocate of creationism in the West." Mr. Heard, in his "Tripartite Nature of Man," says: "Augustine, however, took the side of creationism. Augustine's decision in favor of creationism set the question at rest for centuries. The traducianist theory fell in consequence under a cloud, and was almost reputed a heresy in the Middle Ages." Dr. Shedd, however, in direct conflict with Mr. Heard, says: "The theologian who contributed most to the currency and establishment of traducianism was Augustine." He immediately adds: "And yet this thinker, usually so explicit and decided, even upon speculative points, nowhere in his works formally adopts the theory itself." The truth is, upon the question of the origin of the soul, Augustine nowhere adopts any theory, and refuses to take any position whatever upon the subject, except, perhaps, he opposes the doctrine of the preëxistence of the soul, and denies that the soul is of the essence of

God. Here are a few extracts from his work on "The Soul and its Origin." Addressing Renatus in reply to what Vincentius Viótor had written on the subject, he says of Victor: "To avoid this [running into the heresy of Pelagius], how much better is it for him to share my hesitation about the soul's origin!" "He may say that his opinion is backed by divine authority since he supposes that it is by passages of the Holy Scriptures that he proves that souls are not made by God by way of propagation, but that they are by distinct acts of creation breathed afresh into each individual. Let him prove this if he can, and I will allow that I have learned from him what I was trying to find out with great earnestness." (Page 222.) "Wherefore I too, on my side, say, concerning my soul, I have no certain knowledge how it came into my body, for it was not I who gave it to myself. He who gave it to me knows whether he imparted it to me from my father, or created it afresh for me, as he did for the first man. But even I shall know when he himself shall teach me, in his own good time. Now, however, I do not know; nor am I ashamed, like him [Victor], to confess my ignorance of what I know not." (Pages 230, 231.)

The doctrine of the creation and infusion of the soul at the time of birth, as well as the doctrine of the preëxistence of souls, is allied to the doctrine of individuality which traverses the doctrine of the connection and unity of the race. Adam and his posterity are of one blood—are one race. If the soul is created and infused, instead of propagated, then the soul has no relation to Adam. Nothing, in this event, could be related to Adam except the body. A being belonging in part to a race, and in part a creature belonging to no race, would be an anomaly such as has not, we are persuaded, yet appeared in the dominions of our God.

This doctrine is also opposed to that which lies at the very basis of things—namely, that God, having made the heavens and the earth and all things therein in six days, ceased from his work of creation, resting on the seventh day, and that no act of immediate creation has since occurred therein.

Traducianism, the doctrine of Scripture, teaches that the soul is procreated together with the body. The soul is as much the result and product of conception and birth as is the body. The whole man, the soul and the body, is propagated. It is said that Tertullian was the first who stated and defended the doctrine of traducianism with distinctness. This is, perhaps, true when we speak of it as the subject of controversy in the time of Tertullian. But the doctrine of traducianism has been the distinct doctrine of the Scriptures, and of those who rightly expound them, in all ages. Tertullian advocates this doctrine. He expresses himself in the following manner in his treatise, "*De Anima*:" "Is the substance of both body and soul formed together at one and the same time? or does one of them precede the other in natural formation? We indeed maintain that both are conceived and formed and perfected simultaneously, as well as born together; and that not a moment's interval occurs in their conception, so that a prior place can be assigned to either." (Page 474.) When it is said Adam "begat a son," we are taught that a child was begotten complete in his individuality, and in the constituent elements of his nature. And this individuality and these constituent elements of nature in Seth, the son, include soul and body as essentially as they include soul and body in Adam, the father. The existence of the soul and body of Seth was as much the result of the act of begetting as the existence of the soul and body of Adam was the result of the act of creation. When it is said Adam "begat a

son in his own likeness," the procreation of the soul is taught us, for in the soul alone is found the seat of this "likeness." Unless you can conceive of righteousness and unrighteousness implanted in a corporeal substance, you are bound to concede the procreation and existence of the soul in this case as the constituent nature in which was found that moral likeness named in the premises.

The individual man, in his oneness and being, is evidently constituted by the union of soul and body. Without the soul or without the body we have not the entire man. The two, body and soul, may be separated, but the whole and complete man is found in the two constituting one person. Hence, in referring to man in his individuality, the Scripture sometimes names his body and sometimes names his soul. The Scripture uses these terms, "body" and "soul," interchangeably, as including and referring to the whole man. And such passages as, "These are the sons of Rachel, which were born to Jacob; all the souls were fourteen;" "all the souls that came with Jacob into Egypt, which came out of his loins" (Gen. xlv.), prove that souls are propagated, are born. There is no evading this view of the case, unless you are prepared to say that the soul is a mere appendage, and not essentially a part of man, and that the Scriptures mislead when they speak of the soul as the man. "All souls are mine," saith the Lord God; and this is as true, though the soul is propagated along with the body, as though it were created by a direct act of the Divine hand.

The causes operating in the rejection of the doctrine of traducianism we shall not attempt to trace out. Some of them are, perhaps, unknown to us. The reasons assigned for the rejection of this doctrine are, in our judgment, without foundation. It is alleged that the doctrine of traducianism favors materialism, and is destructive of the doc-

trine of the immortality of the soul. We cannot see that the doctrine is chargeable with any such tendencies or results. We, speaking for ourselves, must say we would not be content to abide in the meshes of such sophistry as that which charges that the production of the soul, *ex traduce*, involves the doctrine of its materiality and mortality. If Adam was a living, spiritual, and immortal being, we cannot see but that he could propagate a man like himself having life, spirit, and immortality. Whether man is naturally immortal, or whether immortality is a blessing bestowed upon him from without, is a question which we find no occasion to discuss here, inasmuch as it is really not pertinent to the question of traducianism.

The true doctrine of the origin of man teaches creation and propagation. He was created as a race in and with Adam, and propagated by and from him. To this no one can object. It underlies the whole scheme of the gospel of Jesus Christ. Men belong to the race of Adam, have descended from him, or they have no relation to and connection with Christ as a Saviour. Any man who has not descended from Adam by generation has no part or interest in the doctrine of regeneration as taught by the Son of God. When we give up the doctrine of the unity of the race, the descent from Adam, and the fall of men in and with Adam, then we may renounce every other doctrine of the gospel of Jesus. The whole gospel scheme fails with these. The redemption made by Christ is a redemption for a race created in, descended from, and fallen and sinful with, Adam.

CHAPTER III.

THE NATURAL AND MORAL STATE WHEREIN ADAM,
THE FIRST MAN, WAS CREATED.

THE Divine Record, while teaching that man was created, and while giving information concerning the constituent elements of his nature, also announces the natural and moral state wherein he was created. "So God created man in his own image; in the image of God created he him." This is one of the most sublime announcements made in the history of creation. Much has been written by different authors, and in different ages, upon this text. Much that has been written in exposition thereof is invaluable and true, while much is not only worthless but highly pernicious.

Man was given dominion over the earth and the creatures therein; howbeit, this did not constitute the image in which he was made. He was created with a body of upright form and well-proportioned parts, but it was not in his physical form or material body that the image of God resided. God is not a being of physical body or material parts, and therefore no image of his could be inwrought in these. Man was made a living soul, and endowed with reason and will, spirituality and immortality. In this soul, thus endowed, was the image of God. Adam was a moral being, and, as such, was in the likeness of God. This image consisted—in part, at least—in knowledge, righteousness, and holiness. Adam, when made, was innocent, but innocence did not constitute the image of God in which he

was created. God could not make a guilty creature any more than he could make an evil and wicked creature. We use the words innocent and guilty here antithetically. Innocence and guilt are antithetical terms. Adam was made morally good. He was righteous, and he was holy.

But what is knowledge? What is righteousness? What is holiness? Knowledge is not only the power of knowing, it is a certain and correct perception of truth and fact. Righteousness is not only conformity to divine law, it is purity of character—purity of being. Holiness is perfect purity of character—of nature. These, it is true, are only general definitions of these terms, but they are accurate, and are sufficiently specific for our purpose here. We may consider these definitions, and the terms defined, more at length in another place.

Adam, at his origin, had the faculty, as God had the faculty, of knowledge; and he also had, as God had, a true and correct knowledge of things as they existed. He, of course, did not have a faculty of knowledge equal in capacity with the divine faculty of knowledge; neither did he have a knowledge equal in extent with the divine knowledge; but, in their measure, both his faculty of knowledge and his actual knowledge were perfect. He was not subject to any mistakes, nor liable to any failures, because of any defect in knowledge. He suffered from no treachery of memory or defect of judgment. He was morally upright; he was morally good. He had absolute holiness, as God had. When we say, as we do here, that Adam was holy, we mean and say more than that he was free from any bias to evil, and that he had the powers necessary to acquire holiness. We mean that he was already holy, that he was right in the state of all his powers. This holiness was con-created in him, was wrought into his very nature when he was made.

That Adam was created holy, as here insisted on, is earnestly and uniformly denied by Arians, Socinians, and all others who deny native depravity and the imputation of Adam's sin to his posterity. Enough from two or three authors of this class to correctly present their positions on this subject is altogether proper, and, in some measure, we are persuaded, necessary.

We will quote first from a volume of published sermons by Henry W. Bellows, minister of All-souls Church, New York. He writes: "But when we are asked to believe that the first man—who, though fresh from the Creator's hands, and no companions to misuse or tempt him aside, on the first opportunity succumbed in his conscience and his will before a frivolous temptation—had a better nature than we have, a keener and clearer conscience, a more erect and powerful will, we confess that reason refuses her assent. In what respect did he exhibit any moral faculty superior to ours? Of what advantage to him was his unfallen nature and his fresh and pure soul?" (Page 246.) "Any other man in his circumstances would have acted as he acted, and every man since *has* acted as he acted. It was not, however, Adam's nature that fell, but merely he himself; that is to say, his nature was no other after his fall than before. It was no more weak than before. For if stronger before he fell than since, how did he yield so easily to temptation? What advantage did his unfallen nature give him? No! Adam's nature was illustrated, not changed, by his fall." (Page 260.)

This writer teaches that Adam's nature was as weak and imperfect before his fall as afterward, and that his nature before his fall was as weak and imperfect as the nature of other men in their present fallen condition, and that the unfallen nature of Adam was in a state of weakness in which he could know nothing of goodness and holiness.

How much meaning he puts into the sentence, "Adam's nature was illustrated, not changed, by the fall!" *Illustrated, not changed!* This Mr. Bellows actually teaches, on the next page to the one from which the above quotation is taken, that Adam and Eve, in their sinlessness, did not reflect God's glory as much as David and Peter, and St. Augustine and Cromwell, did in their sinfulness.

The next author from whom we quote is Dr. A. T. Bledsoe, who was, at the time of his death, and for some years previous thereto had been, the editor of the *Southern Quarterly Review*. He is the author of two or three different published volumes, among them a volume bearing the title, "A Theodicy." This work is the apple of his eye, the darling of his heart. When he wrote it he was a member of the Protestant Episcopal Church, though at the time of his death he was a member of one of the Methodist Churches. His theology is more nearly allied to Arianism than to any other system of theology with which we are acquainted. He is evidently not an Arminian. In his writings, while he claims to have found a solid, consistent, and immovable basis for the doctrines of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, and which basis alone, he thinks, can save our Arminianism from crumbling to its foundations, he claims that he is not an Arminian, and he denies that he is a Calvinist. He says of himself, in his "Theodicy" (pages 26, 27): "The relation which the writer sustains to other systems has been, it appears to himself, most favorable to a successful prosecution of the following speculations. Whether, at the outset of his inquiries, he was the more of an Arminian or of a Calvinist, he is unable to say; but if his crude and imperfectly developed sentiments had been made known, it is probable he would have been ranked with the Arminians. Be this as it may, it is certain that he was never so much of an Arminian, or of any

thing else, as to imagine that Calvinism admitted of nothing great and good. On the contrary, he has ever believed that the Calvinists were at least equal to any other body of men in piety, which is certainly the highest and noblest of all qualities. And besides, it was a constant delight to him to read the great masterpieces of reasoning which Calvinism had furnished for the instruction and admiration of mankind. By this means he came to believe that the scheme of the Arminians could not be maintained, and his faith in it was gradually undermined.

“But although he thus submitted his mind to the dominion of Calvinism as advocated by Edwards, and earnestly espoused it with some exceptions, he never felt that profound, internal satisfaction of the truth of the system after which his rational nature continually longed, and which it struggled to realize. He certainly expected to find this satisfaction in Calvinism, if anywhere. Long, therefore, did he pause over every portion of Calvinism, in order to discover, if possible, how its foundations might be rendered more clear and convincing, and all its parts harmonized among themselves, as well as with the great, undeniable facts of man’s nature and destiny. While engaged in these inquiries, he has been more than once led to see what appeared to be a flaw in Calvinism itself, but without at first perceiving all its consequences. By reflection on these apparent defects—nay, by protracted and earnest meditation on them—his suspicions have been confirmed and his opinions changed.”

In his *Quarterly Review* for 1871 (page 776), he says: “He [President Edwards] has, more than any other man that has ever lived, helped to deliver us from the shallows and the inconsistencies of the popular Arminian theology, and, at the same time, moved us to raise the

standard of revolt against his own cast-iron scheme of Calvinism."

We pass on now to show that Bledsoc teaches that Adam was not created holy. To this end we shall give a number of quotations from his writings, beginning with those which contain his idea and definition of holiness, and following them closely with those containing what he says directly about Adam not being created holy. He names virtue and holiness as the same. We quote from his "Theodicy" as follows: "This [true virtue in the heart] consists not in holy feelings, as they are called, but in holy exercises of the will." (Page 124.) "Virtue and vice lie not in the passive state of the sensibility, nor in any other necessitated states of the mind, but in acts of the will, and in habits formed by a repetition of such free voluntary acts." (Page 131.) "This [virtue] consists not in the possession of moral powers, but in the proper and obedient exercise of those powers." (Page 194.) We quote next from his *Southern Quarterly Review*. From the October number for 1871, we give the following: "The thing for which we seek is not virtue in the abstract, but virtue as it exists in the breast of a moral agent. We seek virtue, not as it is set forth in the external rule or standard of right, but only as it is a quality of mind." (Page 860.) "Virtue consists not in our natural or created endowments, however grand or beautiful, nor in their spontaneous developments, but in *our own personal acting and doing*." (Page 862.) "All virtue or moral goodness, then, consists in acts of the will, and in the habits formed by the repetition of such acts." (Page 863.) "Virtue, or holiness, is, then, a practical habit of the will, voluntary in its origin, inasmuch as it results from a repetition of voluntary acts." (Page 864.) "To say that virtue or holiness can be necessitated, is a contradiction in terms." (Page

868.) "If any thing is necessarily caused in us, it cannot be our virtue or our vice; we can neither be justly rewarded nor punished for it." (April No., p. 271.)

"We say, then, that there never can be virtue or vice in the breast of a moral agent, prior to his own actions and doings. On the contrary, it is insisted by Edwards that true virtue or holiness was planted in the bosom of the first man by the act of creation. 'In a moral agent,' says he, 'subject to moral obligations, it is the same thing to be perfectly innocent as to be perfectly righteous. It must be the same, because there can no more be any medium between sin and righteousness, or between being right and being wrong, in a moral sense, than there can be a medium between straight and crooked in a natural.' This is applied to the first man as he came from the hand of the Creator, and is designed to show that he was created with true holiness, or virtue, in his heart. According to this doctrine, man was made upright, not merely in the sense that he was free from the least bias to evil, or that he possessed all the powers requisite to moral agency, but in the sense that true virtue or moral goodness was planted in his nature by the act of creation. If this be so, the doctrine of a necessary holiness must be admitted; for surely nothing can be more necessary to us, nothing can take place in which we have less to do, than the act by which we are created.

"This, then, is the question which we intend to examine: Whether that which is concreated with a moral agent can be his virtue or his vice. Whether, in other words, the dispositions or qualities which Adam derived from the hand of God partook of the nature of true virtue or otherwise. Edwards assumes the affirmative." ("Theodicy," pages 115, 116.)

"It is agreeable to the voice of human reason that

nothing can be *our virtue*, in the true sense of the word, which was planted in us by the act of creation, and in regard to the production of which we possessed no knowledge, exercised no agency, and gave no consent." (Page 122.) "As Adam deserved no praise on account of what he received at his creation, so such endowments partook not of the nature of true virtue." (Page 123.) "We could regard the glory of the heavens, or the beauty of the earth, with a sentiment of moral approbation as easily as we could ascribe the character of moral goodness to the noble qualities with which the Almighty had been pleased to adorn the nature of the first man." (Page 124.) "If God should cause virtue to exist in the heart of a moral agent, he would work a contradiction." (Page 192.)

We have here Dr. Bledsoe's idea and definition of holiness, and the condition in which he thinks Adam was created. This, his idea of holiness, he tells us, like a new sun, dawned upon his mind after twenty years' severe study, and searching among books, and wandering in darkness. If he had only secured the work of John Taylor, of Norwich, on "Original Sin," he might have found and read in twenty minutes this very idea, and this identical definition of holiness, which he presents to us.

At first thought, it seems to us a pity that he was not saved such long wandering in darkness. But, then, had he found this idea of holiness in Taylor's work on "Original Sin," a work written so long before Bledsoe was born, Bledsoe would have been deprived of the glory of the discovery and original production of the idea! And, again, the light was so brilliant when it dawned upon him!

He declares in so many words that he takes the negative of the question whether Adam was created holy, and announces that he intends to demolish the arguments which Edwards adduces to prove that holiness was planted in the

bosom of Adam by the act of creation. Maintaining that holiness consists in good acts of the will, and in the habits formed by the repetition of such acts, he is bound, by consistency with himself, to maintain that Adam was not created holy. And Dr. Bledsoe goes so far as to make holiness and obedience strictly synonymous. Speaking of what God can and does do, he says: "He gives us all the powers, all the influences, and all the means necessary to obedience, or holiness; but, he does not give us the obedience or holiness itself." (*Review*, 1871, p. 878.)

Obedience and holiness are not the same. They are no more the same than a principle and an act are the same. They are as far from being the same as nature and practice are from being the same. God may not be able to force holiness upon a moral agent against his will, but God could, and he did, create holy beings. Creating a holy being is quite another thing to forcing the will of a moral agent, and making an unholy agent holy against his will. Had not Bledsoe been dazzled by his new idea of holiness, he might have seen this, and then he would have seen the untenableness of his positions and the futility of his arguments.

Before going into a thorough discussion of the merits of these points, we will give what Dr. John Taylor says on the question whether Adam was created holy. Dr. Taylor was an avowed Arian. His definition of holiness and his view of Adam's primitive nature are identical with those of Bledsoe. We quote now from his work on "Original Sin:" "But moral virtue, or holiness, in its very nature, implieth the choice and consent of a moral agent, without which it *cannot* be virtue or holiness. God indeed can, and undoubtedly doth, assist and direct us in this choice and consent, in ways and degrees which we are not able to determine. But still, holiness must necessarily be the choice of our own minds; for how much soever we are assisted in choosing, it

must be our own act and deed, or it cannot be *our* virtue and holiness. A necessary holiness is no holiness; a virtue or righteousness supposed to be forced upon our minds, and irresistibly infused into us, whether we will or not, is no virtue, no righteousness. Therefore, however God may provide and apply means to engage our wills to the observance of what is right and true, it is, I think, demonstration that we cannot as moral agents observe what is right and true, or be righteous and holy, without our own free and explicit choice. And, in consequence, *Adam* could not be originally created in righteousness and true holiness, because he must choose to be righteous before he could be righteous; and therefore he must exist, he must *be created*—yea, he must exercise thought and reflection—before he *was* righteous. For righteousness is the right use and application of our powers; consequently our powers must not only exist, but also be used and applied before we can be righteous.” (Pages 182, 183.)

“In the very nature of things, we cannot be holy without our own choice and endeavor.” (Page 258.)

“For to say that God not only endowed *Adam* with a capacity of being righteous, but, moreover, that righteousness and true holiness were *created* with him, or *wrought* into his nature at the same time he was made, is to affirm a contradiction, or what is inconsistent with the very nature of righteousness. Such a righteousness would have been produced in him without his knowledge and consent, and so would have been no righteousness at all. For it is obvious to the common sense of all mankind that whatever is wrought in my nature without my knowledge and consent cannot possibly be either sin or righteousness in me, because it is not what I choose, it is no act or deed of mine, but introduced into my nature whether I will or not; and consequently I can neither be commended nor condemned,

rewarded nor punished, for it. It is a mere natural instinct, of the same kind with the industry of the bee or the fierceness of the lion. Righteousness is right action. But Adam could not act either in *willing* or *doing* right, before he was created; therefore he must be created, he must exist, and use his intellectual powers, before he could be righteous." ("Supplement," pp. 161, 162.)

"A *habit* is gained by repeated acts; and therefore I do not see how it can properly be applied to *original righteousness*. A natural inclination, propensity, or instinct, may, I conceive, be a principle or spring of action; but in itself can neither be *righteous* nor *righteousness*. For such propensity or principle either is or is not under the government of my will or choice. If *not*, then it can no more be *righteousness* than the palpitation of my heart, or the working of my lungs. If this propensity be under the government and control of my will, then it can be righteous only so far as applied to righteous action in heart or life. For who will say that any propensity or principle in *Adam* would have been holy, or holiness, though never by him applied to any holy purpose? Therefore, it is not the propensity which is *righteousness*, but my right application of it." ("Supplement," p. 164.)

"Whosoever pleases soberly to consider these things, I am persuaded, will see no ground in these texts to conclude that righteousness, or holiness, was *concreated* with *Adam*, or *wrought into his nature*; for neither in them nor in the context is there one word about *Adam*; much less in this, or *any other part of Scripture*, is it affirmed, or so much as intimated, that *Adam* was created in righteousness or holiness." ("Supplement," p. 155.)

Here is taught by Taylor that holiness, or virtue, consists in acts of the will, or habits formed by a repetition of such acts; that holiness does not and cannot exist in a hu-

man being prior to the free, voluntary acts of the will and the habits formed by the repetition of such acts; that nothing that is in one when he comes into the world can be virtue or holiness; and that Adam was not created holy.

Dr. Taylor, insisting that holiness consists in the choice and actions of the will, goes so far as to say that "the highest excellency of intelligent beings, and even of God himself, is virtue, or right action." (Page 76.)

We are ready to concede that if holiness is obedience to law, and consists alone in acts of the will, then there must be choice and action; deeds must be performed, obedience to law must be rendered, before there can be holiness. We are ready also to concede that upon this hypothesis holiness cannot be concreated in the breast of a moral agent, and that the most that could be done in this event would be the creation of a being capable of acquiring holiness. We are even ready to concede that if this idea of holiness be correct the highest excellency of God himself is right action. But we are not ready to accept this idea and definition of holiness. We are not, therefore, ready to concede that holiness cannot be concreated in a moral agent, and we are not ready to concede that the highest excellency of God himself is right action.

Holiness is a quality; holiness is moral goodness, and, as a quality, may be ascribed to character, to nature, to being, as well as to conduct and to action. An act may be holy or vicious, and holiness does not necessarily depend upon the existence of actions for its existence. It may be correct in a practical point of view, when describing what human conduct should be, to say that virtue is voluntary conformity to law. An act may be holy, and it may be a manifestation of holiness, and it may tend to holiness, and it may be the fruit of holiness, but is not essentially holiness itself. An act is simply an act, and may be vicious

or virtuous, and not holiness, as holiness is a quality. There is such a thing as holiness and a holy being, independent of action, and in the absence of action. God is holy, and holiness, independent of what he has done. In the nature of the case, God existed before he acted. It does not affect the truth of this statement to say that his existence and action were coëtaneous. Holiness was in him and of him, and he was holy as he existed in himself in his character, perfections, and being, before he acted. There was a virtuous state of God's faculties, powers, and attributes, before there was an exercise of his powers. His powers and faculties were right and holy before he exercised and applied them in choice and action. Holiness is inherent in the Almighty, and not something acquired by him. His highest excellency is not in his actions, but in himself; not in what he does—which, of course, is always right—but in what he is. And so here was holiness before there was choice, before there was action, before there was a habit of action.

We have nothing to do with the arguments which Dr. Edwards, or any one else, makes in support of the position that Adam was created holy. It makes but little difference with us whether Dr. Bledsoe has succeeded in demolishing Edwards's arguments or not; we are not engaged for their defense; some of them are good, others are perhaps fallacious. But the position that Adam was created holy is scriptural, and the arguments of Drs. Taylor and Bledsoe on the subject, we are sure, are as futile as any arguments ever adduced by any one on any subject.

As holiness can exist before action, and as holiness is an attribute of God, and is not inconsistent with himself, he could make a creature endowed with this quality. Adam, as created, was free from all corruption and from all defect. He was "perfect and right, pure and good."

His powers were all right; each faculty and power was right in itself, and every one properly adjusted in its relations to every other. His judgment, conscience, and will were all evenly balanced, one not stronger nor weaker than the other.

In Ephesians iv. 24 and Colossians iii. 10, the apostle writes: "And that ye put on the new man, which after God is created in righteousness and true holiness." "And have put on the new man, which is renewed in knowledge after the image of him that created him." Here is a direct reference to the creation of Adam in the image of God; and the apostle, giving an exposition of the text in Genesis, which mentions the creation of Adam in the image of God, tells us in what the image of God consisted—righteousness, holiness, and knowledge. Dr. Taylor himself admits that "the apostle may allude here to Adam's being made in the image of God, and taketh his manner of expression from thence." The only way in which he can meet this is to say that "this image, or the habits of virtue and holiness, cannot be created in the same manner as our natural faculties," and that "God created the new man when he created the gospel dispensation." Having nothing better to offer, he would have served his cause by offering nothing in the premises. The declaration that the new man mentioned is the gospel dispensation is absurd, and the opinion that holiness cannot be created in the same manner as our natural faculties has nothing to support it.

Adam, in his primitive nature, was not under the necessity of acquiring a character in order to his approval, but he was created with such nature and in such condition as entitled him to, and secured for him, the approbation and commendation of God, and he only had to retain such nature and condition by obedience to law.

Man, "distinguished link in being's endless chain," was

made to be immortal, to live forever. God did not create him to be "bound to the hasty pinions of an hour," but gave him life with no purpose of taking it from him, unless he forfeited it, and with no limits beyond which it could not extend, and beyond which it could not endure. Adam was not naturally mortal in the sense that he was under a dispensation of death. The Bible teaches that death is the wages of sin, and not the result of natural mortality or physical weakness. Had there been no sin, there would have been no death. The announcement, "In the day that thou eatest thereof, thou shalt surely die," made to Adam in the garden, when he was commanded not to eat of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, has its significance alone in the truth that had he not violated the law of God he never would have died, but would have lived forever. How true in Adam's case, "when lust hath conceived, it bringeth forth sin; and sin, when it is finished bringeth forth death!" Moreover, "by one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin."

We will conclude the subject and the chapter in the language of Pollok:

But man he made of angel form erect,
 To hold communion with the heavens above,
 And on his soul impressed His image fair,
 His own similitude of holiness,
 Of virtue, truth, and love; with reason high
 To balance right and wrong, and conscience quick
 To choose or to reject; with knowledge great,
 Prudence and wisdom, vigilance and strength,
 To guard all force or guile; and, last of all,
 The highest gift of God's abundant grace,
 With perfect, free, unbiased will. Thus man
 Was made upright, immortal made, and crowned
 The king of all.

CHAPTER IV.

MAN'S FIRST TRANSGRESSION.

WHEN the work of creation was completed, man found himself an inhabitant of a region of surpassing beauty, a place of pleasantness and delight, a place where murmuring brooks and birds of sweetest note made music, and trees of richest foliage and most delicious fruits profusely grew—a place overarched with most brilliant skies, perfumed with odoriferous balm, and enriched with most choice gems and precious metals. Man was put in Eden—"choicest spot on earth." "And the Lord God planted a garden eastward in Eden; and there he put the man whom he had formed. And out of the ground made the Lord God to grow every tree that is pleasant to the sight, and good for food; the tree of life also in the midst of the garden, and the tree of knowledge of good and evil. And a river went out of Eden to water the garden; and from thence it was parted, and became into four heads. The name of the first is Pison; that is it which compasseth the whole land of Havilah, where there is gold; and the gold of that land is good; there is bdellium and the onyx-stone. And the name of the second river is Gihon; the same is it that compasseth the whole land of Ethiopia. And the name of the third river is Hiddekel; that is it which goeth toward the east of Assyria. And the fourth river is Euphrates."

The Scriptures describe the location of the garden with sufficient minuteness for us to learn what quarter of the globe it was in. It was somewhere in proximity to the

great rivers of the East. Whether it was on the Euphrates, the Ganges, the Nile, or some other, whether at the source or confluence of these rivers as they now have their rise and course, we cannot tell. The river Euphrates and the country of Ethiopia and of Assyria are all mentioned in the Scripture account of the garden given by Moses. The land of Eden in which the garden was planted was in proximity to these lands. But the geographical limits of these countries, and of the country of Eden, were indefinite, and hence one difficulty of accurately locating the site of the garden where Adam was first domiciled. In what special locality, or in what particular country as now designated, the garden of Eden was situated, we are unable at this distance of time to know. No trace of the garden, so far as we can learn, now remains. If not before, all traces of its site were obliterated by the flood in Noah's time.

Here in this garden, where grew "every tree that is pleasant to the sight, and good for food," Adam was prohibited eating of one tree, the tree of knowledge of good and evil. "Of every tree of the garden thou mayest freely eat; but of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, thou shalt not eat of it." (Gen. ii. 16, 17.)

We have no means of ascertaining what was the specific difference in the tree of the knowledge of good and evil and the other trees of the garden. We know, however, that this tree stood related in some way, symbolically or otherwise, to law. It stood related in some way to moral law. Good and evil, life and death, are all connected with it in its presentation to Adam, and in the prohibition imposed upon him concerning it. These, "good and evil," "life and death," convey to us the idea of moral law. They convey to us the obligations and duties required by moral law, and the awards incident to obedience and disobedience. He who supposes this tree a common apple-tree, with no

significance attaching to it other than such as pertains to a common fruit-tree, has yet to learn its true nature and real significance.

The precept here given to Adam in the injunction of abstinence from this tree was no arbitrary precept arbitrarily imposed, but it was one founded in eternal principles and imposed by the wisest, best, and highest administration. The law given to Adam, of which this precept concerning the tree of the knowledge of good and evil was an embodiment or epitome or symbol or test, was the law of right and wrong, the law of God, which required homage to the Creator and Lord, Judge and Ruler, of moral beings. It is not to be supposed, therefore, that the bare act of eating or not eating of this tree was all that was required and embraced in the law under which Adam was created and, at the first, lived. This precept was not only not arbitrary, it was simple, and of easy performance. Such a plain and easy duty, connected with such circumstances and objects as presented to his mind and kept constantly before him his Lord and Maker, and the exalted character of his own nature, and the benedictions involved in the issues, was calculated, one would think, to prompt Adam to the greatest fidelity in his actions and in his desires.

Adam was absolutely able to keep this commandment, and altogether competent to violate it. He possessed a will, and was consequently endowed with freedom. Will is a faculty of the human soul. Will is not choice, but is the faculty or inherent endowment of the soul by which choice is made. Choice is the decision of the will in favor of one thing rather than in favor of something else. Freedom, which is immunity from compulsion, is a native endowment of the soul. Will and freedom, though not the same, are inseparable endowments; and every choice, as it is a decision of the will, is reached independently of all external

and necessitating causes and agencies. The question concerning the power of the will to choose is not whether "the will chooses the contrary of what it does choose, which is self-contradiction," but whether it can choose the contrary of what it does choose. Adam was a moral agent under moral law, with a will unimpaired. He was put upon probation and under trial. The terms, conditions, injunctions, and threatened penalties contained in the law imposed on him all indicate probation and trial. His condition involved contingency. Contingency has nothing to do in determining the will to one thing rather than to another, any more than has necessity; but there is always contingency, and not necessity, where there is choice. Adam's condition as a moral agent under probation involved more than contingency; it involved the contingency of sinning. He was perfectly competent to choose right or wrong, good or evil. Some have maintained that it was foreordained and decreed by the Author of his being that Adam should do what he did—sin and die—and that he was so under imperative necessity and irresistible forces that he could not choose or do otherwise than as he did. Than which nothing is more repugnant to the nature of man and the moral government of God. Adam was under no necessity, decree, or foreordination which made it inevitable that he must sin and die. He was subjected to and controlled by no forces which were irresistible. But it was as much within the limits of his condition and capacity to choose the path of obedience, do right and live, as it was to choose the path of disobedience, do wrong and die.

It has been maintained that this prohibition is of the nature of a positive precept, as distinguished from a moral precept. In former times the distinctive nature and comparative value of moral and positive precepts and duties engaged much attention. The controversy on this subject

seems to have connected itself with the controversy about the necessity and sufficiency of natural and revealed religion, as compared the one with the other. Dr. Waterland, in a treatise on "The Nature, Obligation, and Efficacy of the Christian Sacraments," a work published in London in 1730, treats of the distinction between moral and positive duties, and of the comparative value, excellency, and obligation of moral and positive precepts. In this treatise he says: "But *moral* law, in a more restrained sense, signifies the same with *natural* law, a law derived from God, consonant to the *nature* and reason of things, and therefore of as fixed and immovable obligation as the nature and reason of things is. *Positive* divine law, in contradistinction to the other, is not founded in the fixed nature or reason of things, or at least not known to be so, being considered only as *prescribed*, and as depending on God's good pleasure either to remove or continue it." (Pages 7, 8.)

Thomas Chubb, a deist, and an extensive writer, in a work styled, "A Discourse Concerning Reason with regard to Religion and Divine Revelation," to which are added some reflections upon the comparative excellency and usefulness of moral and positive duties, and bearing date London, 1731, says: "By 'moral duties,' I understand the performance of such actions as are in themselves right, and fit to be performed by every intelligent being, or moral agent, in equal circumstances; which fitness results solely from the nature and reason of things, when considered abstractedly from and antecedent to any promulgated law, whether human or divine. . . . By 'positive duties,' I understand the performance of such actions as, in reason, we are not obliged to perform, when considered abstractedly from and antecedent to any promulgated law that requires our performance of them." (Pages 33, 34, 58.)

According to the ideas of these authors, moral precepts

are founded in the eternal and immutable reasons of things, and are natural, indispensable, universal, permanent, and eternal; while positive precepts are founded alone in the pleasure of God, or in prudential reasons, and are temporary—limited to times, places, and persons.

In the controversy about moral precepts and duties, there has been a division as to which is more excellent, and to which the preference must be given, and, in case one interferes with the other, which ought to be obeyed. One author (Waterland) says: "There may be as great virtue (or greater) in obeying *positive* precepts as in obeying moral ones. There may be as great (or greater) iniquity and impiety in disobeying *positive* precepts as in disobeying *moral* ones." (Page 15.) Dr. Samuel Clarke and others say "that positive observances are not to be compared with moral virtues." "That moral duties are always to be preferred before positive, when they stand in competition." Mr. Chubb says: "I have shown that when moral and positive duties come in competition with respect to their excellency, etc., then moral duties are greatly preferable to positive duties." (Page 76.)

It is not improper to define precepts and duties, and that there are essential differences in many of them cannot be questioned; but we doubt whether the terms "moral" and "positive" are the proper terms by which to make the distinctions and describe the characteristic differences pertaining to precepts. We think all divine laws and precepts imposed upon moral agents are moral laws and precepts, and that all duties required of moral agents by God are moral duties. Some of the laws and precepts which God imposes upon moral agents seem to be special and temporary, but they are as much moral as the more general and permanent and ever-enduring; and one law which God imposes upon moral agents is founded as much in the rea-

son and fitness of things as any other of his laws. As to which is the more excellent, and which, in case there be a conflict betwixt them, should be obeyed in preference, we have this to say: There is no ground, abstractly, of superior excellence in the one or the other. Abstractly considered, the excellence of one precept is equal to the excellence of any and every other precept. The precepts of God never, under any circumstances, nor in any event, stand in competition with each other. There is never any conflict in the duties imposed by the law of God. God never can impose any law which is in conflict with himself, and so, in the nature of the case, there can be no competition in any of his precepts. A duty may be enjoined which can be discharged only at stated times and on special occasions and in specific relations, but every other duty enjoined is in abeyance when that is exacted, and that without ignoring or violating any divine precept.

We have no disposition to ignore the lines of distinction in the laws of God as drawn out and set forth under the terms "moral," "ceremonial," etc.; but, as stated, we doubt whether the terms "moral" and "positive" are the proper terms to use in the connection in which they stand in the discussion concerning the nature of the divine precepts; and we would never convey the idea that positive, ceremonial, and ecclesiastical laws and precepts are not also moral so far as they are from God, and are of binding obligation upon moral agents.

The prohibition of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil involved all that is involved in moral relations and moral obligations, and was founded in these relations and obligations as unmistakably as is the command, "Thou shalt have no other gods before me."

The account of the temptation in the garden is one of the most important recorded in the history of man:

"Now the serpent was more subtile than any beast of the

field which the Lord God had made; and he said unto the woman, Yea, hath God said, Ye shall not eat of every tree of the garden? And the woman said unto the serpent, We may eat of the fruit of the trees of the garden, but of the fruit of the tree which is in the midst of the garden, God hath said, Ye shall not eat it, neither shall ye touch it, lest ye die. And the serpent said unto the woman, Ye shall not surely die: for God doth know, that in the day ye eat thereof, then your eyes shall be opened; and ye shall be as gods, knowing good and evil. And when the woman saw that the tree was good for food, and that it was pleasant to the eyes, and a tree to be desired to make one wise, she took of the fruit thereof, and did eat; and gave also unto her husband with her, and he did eat. And the eyes of them both were opened, and they knew that they were naked; and they sewed fig-leaves together, and made themselves aprons. And they heard the voice of the Lord God walking in the garden in the cool of the day; and Adam and his wife hid themselves from the presence of the Lord God amongst the trees of the garden." (Gen. iii. 1-8.)

This is no allegory, but an historical account of a literal transaction. This record in Genesis is in the form and style of history, and the New Testament writings make such allusions to the subject as can be made only to real events of historical notoriety and authority. "But I fear, lest by any means, as the serpent beguiled Eve through his subtilty, so your minds should be corrupted from the simplicity that is in Christ." (2 Cor. xi. 3.) "And Adam was not deceived, but the woman being deceived was in the transgression." (1 Tim. ii. 14.) The terms, "the similitude of Adam's transgression," and "by one man sin entered into the world," found in the Epistle to the Romans, are evidently allusions to the transgression in the garden, and demonstrate that it was a real occurrence recorded as history.

The questions pertaining to the power of speech in the serpent, with many other curious questions upon the subject, we shall not discuss, as they are of no vital interest. It appears that the serpent was not only endowed with a degree of discernment and subtile ingenuity of mind and thought, but also with speech; though Milton makes Eve say to the serpent,

Thee, serpent, subtlest beast of all the field
I knew, but not with human voice indued.

The serpent occupied the position of an agent in the temptation. He was a beast of the field, but the instrument of Satan in the work of temptation. This is an important point in the premises. The proof that Satan was the chief and leading actor in this temptation, using the serpent as his chosen instrument, is conclusive and easily adduced. "Ye are of your father the devil, and the lusts of your father ye will do: he was a murderer from the beginning, and abode not in the truth, because there is no truth in him. When he speaketh a lie, he speaketh of his own: for he is a liar, and the father of it." (John viii. 44.) "That old serpent, called the Devil, and Satan, which deceiveth the whole world." (Rev. xii. 9.) "For the devil sinneth from the beginning. For this purpose the Son of God was manifested, that he might destroy the works of the devil." (1 John iii. 8.)

The works of the devil which Christ came to destroy were begun in the seduction of Adam, as well as in the apostasy of Satan himself. The above passages are inapplicable upon any other hypothesis than that Satan was the author of the temptation, and the serpent his instrument.

The serpent did not approach Adam directly, but

Led Eve, our credulous mother, to the tree
Of prohibition,

and beguiled her into eating thereof. She was engaged in advance of Adam in the transgression, and induced him to transgress.

She gave him of that fair, enticing fruit
With liberal hand: he scrupled not to eat,
Against his better knowledge; not deceived,
But fondly overcome with female charm.

If it be asked through what channels the first pair, innocent and holy as they were, could be approached and seduced from the path of obedience, and how they could sin, we answer, The temptation was presented to Eve through the faculties and senses of mind and body with which she was naturally endowed. She had sight, taste, and desire—all capable of gratification, and demanding the same. For the gratification of these, she could act; and through these she could be acted upon, moved, and controlled. Sin, therefore, came in through the natural channels of her being, as they were operated upon and appealed to by external agencies and objects. The serpent, in presenting to her the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, appealed to these natural faculties and senses of mind and body. By his false and yet subtle representations he succeeded in making it appear to her that the fruit of this tree was a good and proper food with which to gratify the taste, and beautiful and pleasant for the gratification of the sight, and exactly adapted to the gratification of the desire for the attainment of knowledge. He made this representation for the purpose of deceiving her and inducing her to sin. He succeeded in the first, and in the last. He deceived her, and she sinned. Through the same avenues, Adam was approached and tempted, only from a different stand-point, and without being deceived. Being in his trial and probation free, and following the leadings of his appetites and

desires at his own will, as Eve had done, without any irresistible forces on the one hand or constraining necessity on the other, he ate that which God had said he must not eat, and this was sinning, and here was sin. And the ever-recurring questions of profoundest interest, Whence came sin? Through what approaches did sin enter into the dominions of God? are answered. Sin originated with the moral agents which God created and put upon trial. So far as our race is concerned, sin originated with Adam and Eve, and consisted, in its origin, in eating the fruit of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil when they were tempted by the serpent.

As the eating of the fruit of this tree was an impingement against the divine law, the act could not accord with any decree or purpose of the divine government. The Lord could no more foreördain and decree sin as an original and abstract purpose of his government than he could lie or constitute himself unholy. Every thing, sinning included, which takes place in the universe is permitted by God, inasmuch as he does not prevent it, and it actually comes to pass; but sin is never permitted by God in the sense of having his approval, either in advance of the act or after its occurrence. These are self-evident truths, needing no array of evidence or parade of argumentation for their demonstration.

The existence of demons, or evil spirits, is first taught in this historical record of the temptation in the garden. Here we learn that there are malignant spirits, who hate God and every man, and who oppose the one and injure the other, so far as they have power so to do. A traditional account of the devil and his approach to Adam and Eve in the garden in the form of a serpent has been possessed by almost all heathen nations, both ancient and modern. The temptation in the garden by the evil one in

the form of a serpent has, no doubt, constituted the basis of the legends, fables, and fictions of the heathen nations of antiquity, as well as many of their doctrines concerning evil, obscure, perverted, and superstitious as they are. It is very likely, after all, that the doctrine of Manes concerning a good and evil spirit, absurd and false as it is, had its rise in this history of the temptation of Adam. Satan, according to Scripture, is the chief and leader of an innumerable company of evil spirits who, made good by God, retained not their holy estate, but voluntarily sinned and apostatized. Men and devils have become sinful through their own choice and actions. God created them moral agents, and put them on trial for nobler purposes and better ends; but they committed sin, and stand in the universe of God as the authors of evil.

We must henceforth consider man fallen, sinful.

CHAPTER V.

THE CONSEQUENCES OF THE FIRST TRANSGRESSION OF
THE FIRST MAN.

THE command to refrain from touching and eating of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil was given with the premonition, "In the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die." This was not an empty threat, however threatening; nor was it simply prophetic, however foreseeing. It was an enactment of penalty against sin, and an admonition against incurring guilt and falling under punishment. There was nothing indefinite, however comprehensive, or uncertain, however contingent, about the consequences which would follow the eating of the fruit of that tree. It is not more certain that truth is unchangeable than that death is attendant upon sin. Adam disregarded the premonition, committed the offense, and fell under the penalty. This involves much every way. Death was the fruit of Adam's first disobedience. But what is it to die? What were the consequences of Adam's sin upon himself? These are questions for consideration in this connection. This death spoken of was something incurred by sin, and that would not have existed, and did not exist, while there was no disobedience. To argue a self-evident proposition, as this is, appears to us an absurdity. To admonish one to avoid, by abstaining from contingent acts, consequences which are inevitable, whether the acts are done or not, would be inconsistent with integrity, and utterly futile. As the All-wise God is sincere, and as an intelligent creature cannot be deterred, by the announcement of a visitation which

will as certainly come in the absence of the act as with it, from doing an act, it is evident that the death here announced must be something to which Adam was not exposed while the prohibited tree was untouched—while there was no sin.

In the various meanings of the term “to die” we define it, to lose life; to expire; to decay; to pass away from this present world; to cease to be; to lose all the powers and balances of life; to fall under wrath and condemnation; to be punished with everlasting punishment. Adam fell under the power and liability of death in all these ideas of death. His body and soul were under the power and dominion of death, and liable to eternal death. He did not escape everlasting punishment because it was not included in his sentence of death for sin, but because he was rescued from the sentence which, but for provisional methods and results, would have consigned him to everlasting punishment—to eternal death. Adam suffered, in consequence of his sin, the weakening of his powers, the corruption of his nature, and the perversion of his relations. He lost his relations to the very fountain of life, and his capacities for life. He suffered damage in all his faculties, particularly his reason and his will.

Reason is the faculty of the soul which tests and comprehends the natures and relations of beings and things, together with the uses of things and the results of actions. Thomas Chubb defines reason: “That faculty or power of the mind by which men *discern* and *judge* of right and wrong, of good and evil, of truth and error, and the like.” This faculty in Adam was perfect and correct before his fall, but otherwise after his sin. Before his alliance with Satan, and his apostasy, he apprehended correctly the nature of the things about him, and the nature of the God with whom he had to do. After his apostasy, it was far

otherwise. He was so perverted and darkened in his reason after he had sinned that he essayed to hide himself from the all-seeing eye of God amongst the trees of the garden, and attempted also to shield himself from the charge of his offense by transferring it to Eve.

It should not be maintained that reason, as a faculty, was annihilated in Adam or his posterity by his sin. The faculty, as such, still remained after his sin, but it was darkened, weakened, corrupted—all wrong. Sin, nor any thing else, except God, can annihilate the soul or body of man, or any faculties thereof. Therefore we do not mean that reason was annihilated in Adam, but only that it was weakened and perverted so that it did not apprehend the truth.

Since the fall, reason in man cannot, in and of itself, originate or discover the truth or the law or the rule of action. Reason cannot be a rule of human action. Reason, without revelation and some supernatural and extraneous aid, is wholly incompetent to arrive at any correct knowledge, or perform any right thing. With the divine law supplied and made known, and the aid of the light which cometh down from above given, reason may exercise itself in testing and judging of the divine law as it is in itself, and in its demands as a rule of life; and reason has a proper function in this behalf, and cannot be ignored without great error and absolute damage. The effort to exalt reason and expel the book of revelation is but the pride originating in the blindness of perverted reason. In support of the position that reason is a sufficient guide in matters of religion, without any thing superadded, it is argued that Adam's discerning faculty, or reason, was not weakened or impaired, but that it was rather improved, by his transgression. This position, as well as the argument adduced in its support, is untenable and unscriptural. The passages of Scripture relied on by the advocates of this theory of reason are Gen.

iii. 6, 7, 22: "And when the woman saw that the tree was good for food, and that it was pleasant to the eyes, and a tree to be desired to make one wise, she took of the fruit thereof, and did eat, and gave also unto her husband with her; and he did eat. And the eyes of them both were opened, and they knew that they were naked; and they sewed fig-leaves together, and made themselves aprons. . . . And the Lord God said, Behold, the man is become as one of us, to know good and evil."

In the first place, that the tree was good for food, and possessed properties to make one truly wise, was a false and pernicious view of the case; for, according to the truth in the premises, the tree was not, under the circumstances, good for food, and had, under the circumstances, no wisdom-inparting properties. In the second place, when their eyes were opened they were opened to the fact that they had sinned and lost their former state and standing. The fact that they were naked was not a discovery first made by Adam and Eve after they had sinned. They knew their nakedness before they sinned, and knew it no better after they had sinned than before. The discovery of their nakedness required no special exercise or strength of reason, but only the use of the natural eyesight. Perhaps they attained a knowledge and view of things after they had sinned which they did not before possess, though this knowledge and view were not attained through the medium of improved reason, but only grew out of the existence and results of their sin, which were before wanting. We are not disposed to deny, if any one insists on it, that perhaps they may have recovered from a perverted view which, by the intrigues of Satan, they had been led to entertain, and that then they saw actually what before they might have seen prospectively—the evil results of their sin. They might have known beforehand, as they had been told by God,

that their sin would be accompanied by guilt and attended by death. They did know it until they were led away from the truth. They now realized this by actual experience, notwithstanding the blindness and weakness under which they had fallen. In the third place, when God said, "The man is become as one of us, to know good and evil," he did not intend to announce that man, by his sin, and since his transgression, had become God, or the equal of God in the strength and clearness of his reason or any other of his faculties. Man had now, by his experience under the facts of the case, an actual knowledge of good and evil. This, and nothing more.

The devotees of reason may talk of absurdities and things unreasonable, but what can be more absurd and unreasonable than that by his transgressions a man's understanding is improved and his faculties strengthened?

By his natural reason, unassisted, man cannot comprehend and correctly apprehend things. It was by the aid of supernatural light that Adam, after his sin, apprehended things, so far as he apprehended them at all. After his apostasy Adam was placed anew on trial, and under the requisitions of God's law. The obligations to obedience to this law were not now laid upon him because he retained a natural capacity sufficiently strong in itself and clear in its perceptions to apprehend and obey the law, but because—by God, through grace—light, strength, and capacity were conferred upon him for these ends. And here is where the argument about the unreasonableness of requiring man to do, and holding him accountable for not doing, if reason is not a sufficient guide, breaks down. If there can be found on all the earth a human being destitute of revelation, and destitute of supernatural light and aid, and thus destitute by no fault of his own or his ancestors, but only by the failure of God to give the revelation and confer the light

and aid, then such an individual is not responsible for any thing by him done or left undone. But such a destitution of revelation, light, and aid cannot be found. God has revealed his will and made known his law to all men, and if any are without a knowledge thereof it is because they, having eyes to see, see not, and having ears to hear, they hear not.

Adam, we have said, suffered damage in his will. Not that his will, any more than his soul, was annihilated. We suppose that even Satan, sinful and lost as he is, has a will; and so had Adam, even when he had sinned, and before he was recovered from his sin. There is not a moral agent in the universe of God, however sinful, lost, miserable, and doomed, but that has a will. But the will of devils is averse to all good, and so is that of a sinful man aside from the prevenient grace of God.

One sin is enough to destroy all inherent goodness and constitute the sum of all guilt, and put in force the full penalty of all sin. This is an avowed and unchangeable principle of the divine government; and all moral agents, so far as they are liable to commit sin, are subject to this principle. Man, in his present condition, is subject to this principle of the divine law; and so was Adam in his primitive state and trial, as well as the angels who were on trial in their original condition. He that violates the law in one point is guilty of all. "He that is unjust in the least is unjust also in much." In the case of Adam and his one sin this was as true as in any other sin and in any other individual. Adam suffered deterioration in his moral feelings and in his intellectual powers. His whole head was sick and his whole heart was faint. In this sinful state there was on his part no perception of the truth and no love of it. "For every one that doeth evil hateth the light." He had no spiritual life-giving affiliation with God. By Adam

both sin and death entered into the world. For this there is specific Scripture declaration. Sin and death entering into the world by Adam, he could not be free from either. He could not sin and still not be sinful. He could not bring death into the world and then not be obnoxious to death himself. He could not be sinful, and at the same time have any good thing dwelling in his flesh. He could not be sinful, and at the same time not be subject to vanity and the bondage of corruption. He could not be sinful without being under the lusts of the flesh, fulfilling the desires of the flesh and of the mind, and being a child of wrath. When he gave himself up to sin he gave himself up to vile affections. A rebellious mind, not being subject to the law of God, is a carnal mind. Adam rebelled, and then, possessing a carnal mind, was sold under sin. Having sinned, and having become thereby sinful, he was "dead in trespasses and in sins." That any should call this in question, is stranger than fiction.

As to whether Adam suffered merely a privation of original righteousness, or an infusion of actual and positive evil upon his apostasy, is to us of little consequence, as we do not propose to state the subject either way. The infusion of evil into human nature by God is in no way involved in the nature and facts of the case. It is as much allied to any other subject as that of the depravity incident upon man's apostasy. God, of course, never infused positive evil into human nature either at the creation or at the apostasy of man. But when Adam sinned original righteousness ceased, and he became positively corrupt and absolutely evil in his nature. Sin and righteousness cannot exist together. A sinner cannot be holy; and where there is not holiness there is corruption. Guilty, corrupt, dead spiritually, under sentence of temporal and eternal death, and the Divine wrath resting upon him, Adam was sent

forth from the garden. He was ushered out of the garden, standing upon the threshold of a redemptive dispensation, in which were involved the issues and contingencies of life and death.

Death, which is the antithesis of life, fell upon Adam as certainly as the passages hereunto attached are true: "The wages of sin is death;" "By one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin." If sin produces death temporal in the case of other individuals, it did so in the case of Adam. If sin produces death spiritual in the case of other individuals, it did so in the case of Adam. If sin places other individuals under liability to eternal death, it placed Adam under the same liability. Any logic which would insist on any other conclusion is worse than sophistry.

CHAPTER VI.

THE CONSEQUENCES OF THE FIRST TRANSGRESSION OF
THE FIRST MAN.

WAS Adam's sin in eating of the fruit of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil only personal, and did the consequences thereof terminate in himself, or did they reach to and involve his posterity? Here are points of greatest moment. From the time, at least, of Pelagius to the present, various and antagonistic views have been maintained on these points by different persons; and there is as much opposition to the true doctrine now as at any day during the controversy. The great body of the Church, however, has been settled all the while on the true foundations in the premises.

Pelagius, generally reputed a Briton by birth (though of this there is some doubt), who lived a good while at Rome, and who flourished in the early part of the fifth century, believed and taught—if he has been correctly represented by St. Augustine, who was his antagonist—that “Adam's sin injured only himself, and not the human race, and that infants at their birth are in the same state that Adam was before his transgression.” Though when he was on trial before the authorities of the Church for heresy, he said: “Infants are not in the same state in which Adam was before his transgression, because they are not yet able to understand the commandment, whereas he was able; and because they do not yet possess that choice of a rational will which he indeed possessed, for otherwise no commandment would have been given to him.” This last position is no recanta-

tion or denial of the other, though it was so regarded by his antagonists. One is no contradiction of the other. Pelagius constantly and uniformly held that "nothing good and nothing evil, on account of which we are deemed either laudable or blameworthy, is born with us, that we are formed naturally without either virtue or vice, and previous to the action of our own proper will, the only thing in man is what God has formed in him." He constantly said: "Sin is not born with a man, is not the fault of nature, but of the human will." He held that original sin, so far as the descendants of Adam are concerned, consists in sins committed by them in imitation of the example of Adam, the first sinner, and not in an evil nature communicated by natural descent. He maintained that Adam was created neither holy nor unholy; that he was naturally mortal, and would have died had he not sinned; that every one when born is in these respects just as Adam was at his creation.

Dr. John Taylor, to whom we have referred in a previous chapter, rejects and denounces the doctrine of the imputation of Adam's sin to his posterity. He also anathematizes the doctrine that infants are liable to punishment at all, although he admits that they suffer. The following are some of his utterances, found in his work on "Original Sin:"

"The real guilt of our first parents' transgression must be personal, and belong only to themselves." "Imputed guilt is imaginary guilt." "I cannot find in all the Scripture that one man's sin is ever said to be imputed to another, or, in particular, that Adam's sin is ever said to be imputed to his posterity." "Infants coming into the world with sinful nature is only imagined and supposed, but neither is nor can possibly be proved." "We are born neither righteous nor sinful, but capable of being either, as we improve

or neglect the goodness of God, who sends every man into the world under his blessing."

In fact, he taught, as we have shown in a preceding chapter, that Adam was not created holy, and that his apostasy, even so far as he himself was concerned, was not "a *falling from* a state of perfect holiness, but a *falling short* of such a state." Strange as it may appear after all this, Dr. Taylor admits that Adam's posterity are involved in the consequences of his sin so far as they suffer the death of the body. He says: "The true answer to this question, How far are you involved in the consequences of Adam's sin? is this: We are thereby, or thereupon, subject to temporal sorrow, labor, and death."

Dr. Albert T. Bledsoe, in his writings, following in the track of Taylor, renounces the doctrine of the imputation of Adam's sin to his posterity. He denies that children are born guilty on account of Adam's sin, and also denies that they are liable to punishment on account thereof. He denies native or inborn depravity. He calls the doctrine of the imputation of Adam's sin to his posterity a "dark film," which he says we ought to "wipe out." He insists that the imputation of Adam's sin to his posterity is not consistent with the goodness of God, nor with human goodness. He says: "This scheme of imputation, so far from being an expression of infinite goodness, were indeed an exhibition of the most frightful cruelty and injustice." In another place: "There are few persons whose feelings will allow them to be consistent advocates of the doctrine of the imputation of Adam's sin." (See "Theodicy," pp. 250, 255, 259.) Again, he writes it out in this style: "A theologian may eat and sleep and suffer on higher principles than mere animals do; but we seriously doubt if infants ever eat or sleep or suffer on any higher principles." "For these reasons, we refuse to justify the sufferings of infants,

on the ground that the sin of Adam was imputed to them." ("Theodicy," pp. 267, 272.) Dr. Bledsoe quotes the theory of Arminius on the imputation of Adam's sin to his posterity, and says of it: "That such a theory should ever have obtained in the Christian world is certainly a most impressive and instructive historical fact. It does not deserve, and, at the present day, it does not demand, a serious refutation." (*Southern Review*, April, 1871, pp. 253, 254.) In this same article of this *Review*, p. 288, he sets forth his own hypothesis upon the sinfulness of infants, as follows: "We assume the position that newborn infants have no moral character at all. In so far as the transgression of the moral law is concerned, they are perfectly innocent, never having incurred its penalty by any thing they have thought or done or desired. In the eye of the moral law, infinitely pure as it is, there is no transgression in them."

We have already given, in a previous chapter, his utterances against the position that Adam was created holy.

These authors—Pelagius, Taylor, and Bledsoe—to whom we have referred, all manifestly agree in the substantial points concerning the consequences of Adam's sin upon his posterity. Their positions are identical, and their arguments much alike—often the same.

The true doctrine is that the race are, through Adam, gone away from original righteousness—that is, the righteousness in which Adam was created—and are now by nature inclined only to evil. All are born in sin—born with a corrupt or sinful nature. As the poet expresses it:

We are vile, conceived in sin,
And born unholy and unclean.

Corruption did not and does not originate in bad example, but is by natural descent; it is innate.

Adam's sin in the garden was an individual sin in that he sinned in his own person, and for himself. But then his

sin was the act of one in a representative capacity, and the consequences of his sinful act reached to and involved his posterity. All who have come into actual existence by propagation from Adam have come into existence under the malediction of Adam's sin, and obnoxious to all its penal consequences. Adam was, under the law of his being, and under the law to which he was amenable, the head and representative of his posterity. Under the law of his being, he was the natural head of his race. This is self-evident. He is the father of all. In a previous chapter we have noticed the fact that all descend from Adam by propagation. There is an essential connection between Adam and his posterity in the entire nature of body and soul. Under the moral law, to which he was amenable, Adam was the head and representative of his race. He was made to propagate his race, and the legal provisions of the covenant under which he was placed in the garden embraced his children; and thus he was allied to his posterity not only by nature, but in law. In the legal covenants made with him and bound upon him, he was constituted and recognized as the head and representative of those who were seminally in him and were to spring from him. The Scriptures, incidentally and otherwise, present this truth in many places. Adam stood at the threshold of time, and at the beginning of a moral dispensation in a natural and legal relation to a race seminally contained in him. In the nature of the case, as this moral dispensation commenced in him, and its legal obligations were laid upon him, and its legal consequences were bound up with his actions in the premises—and as this dispensation commenced in the recognition of the posterity to proceed from him, and in provision for that posterity—he was the contracting head and legal representative of the same. This must be admitted. If God had created Adam as he did the angels, singly and alone, without the capaci-

ties and purposes of propagation, and placed him as he did them on trial for himself alone, the consequences of his conduct could have terminated only on himself. But he made him, and entered upon the government of him, with his posterity included and involved. God made them male and female, and said unto them, "Multiply and replenish the earth and subdue it, and have dominion over it." It is useless to think of Adam separate from his posterity. God projected his dispensation for Adam, and established his government over him with his posterity included and involved. The very dominion which Adam was commissioned to attain over the earth was to be secured and maintained by and through his posterity, whom he represented. The representative character and relation of Adam is clearly presented in 1 Cor. xv. 22, 45: "For as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive. . . . The first man Adam was made a living soul; the last Adam was made a quickening spirit." Whatever else these passages may teach, and whatever else may be involved in a complete interpretation of these scriptures, they bring out the representative relations of Adam the first man and of Christ the God-man. There can be no question but that Adam and Christ are presented here in their relations to the whole race. Their relations to the race are such as can be predicated of no other man or men. These relations stand connected with sin and its consequences in and upon the race. Adam has a representative relation to the race in the origin of sin and death; and Christ has a representative relation to the race in the provisions for the removal and cure of sin and death. The purpose of the apostle is so pointed and absolute that he presents their representative and legal relations to the race by calling them both Adam. Adam and Christ stand equally related legally and representatively to mankind. Adam, the progenitor of the race, is the

“one man” by whom “sin entered into the world, and death by sin.” Christ, the Messiah, the Second Adam, “is the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world.” Adam is the man by whom “came death.” Christ is the man by whom “came also the resurrection of the dead.” Adam is the one by whose “offense” “judgment came upon all men to condemnation.” Christ is the one by whose “righteousness” “the free gift came upon all men in order to justification of life.” Adam is the one by whose “disobedience many were made sinners.” Christ is the one by whose “obedience many shall be made righteous.” These are plain Scripture truths which no one can reject without a flat denial of the word of God. These are truths which no metaphysical jargon or pretended learned lore should be allowed to mystify. Adam’s sin was transmitted to his posterity by generation. Corruption is by natural descent; it is inborn, and not acquired by the imitation of bad example, nor by the formation of evil habits. It is true that the following of bad example, the performance of wicked deeds, and the indulgence of evil habits, will and do corrupt; but what we insist on in this connection is that this corruption of nature exists prior to the imitation of bad example, and is antecedent to the performance of any wicked deeds, and the formation of any evil habits. By virtue of this inborn corruption, Adam’s offspring are sinful at their birth. This inborn corruption is of the nature of sin. Every thing produces its like. The lion produces a lion; the horse, a horse; an oak, an oak; etc. No one “can bring a clean thing out of an unclean,” and so Adam, fallen and corrupt as he was, “begat a son in his own likeness, after his image.” And every child of Adam may truly say: “Behold, I was shapen in iniquity; and in sin did my mother conceive me.” Inspiration records the mournful fact that “the wicked are estranged from the womb; they go astray as soon as they be

born, speaking lies;" while the Son of God declares, "That which is born of the flesh is flesh;" and the apostle teaches that "by one man's disobedience many were made sinners." There is such a thing as a "carnal mind," which is "enmity against God," and a heart in every man born into the world that "is deceitful above all things, and desperately wicked;" and it is moreover true that "out of the heart proceed evil thoughts, murders, adulteries, fornications, thefts, false witness, blasphemies." From age to age this corruption has been transmitted by generation. All being born with wicked and deceitful hearts, out of which proceed evil thoughts, murders, etc., "there is not a just man upon earth that doeth good and sinneth not." "There is none righteous; no, not one."

Adam's sin was imputed to his posterity in legal administration. Rom. v. 16, 18, 19 may be adduced as positive authority for this assertion: "The judgment was by one to condemnation. . . . By the offense of one judgment came upon all men to condemnation. . . . By one man's disobedience many were made sinners." Here are judicial terms. They describe judicial proceedings in the administration of government, and in the execution of law. The government was administered, and the law was executed. The judgment rendered passed sentence of condemnation against the offense and upon the offender. The sentence of condemnation, for this one offense of this one man Adam, was issued against and imposed upon all men. By this one man's one disobedience, all men, his whole posterity, were constituted sinners. Human language could not be more direct or pointed. No words could more emphatically declare that Adam's sin has been charged to his children, and that these children are constituted sinners thereby, and condemned and punished therefor, than do these words of the apostle.

The Lord, in the administration of his government over Adam, and the execution of his law against Adam's sin, issued a sentence of condemnation against his posterity, and this judicial sentence places all men from their birth under the full penalty of Adam's offense.

CHAPTER VII.

THE CONSEQUENCES OF THE FIRST TRANSGRESSION OF
THE FIRST MAN.

CERTAIN objections are urged against the doctrines that we are maintaining which it is eminently proper to consider. These objections we shall investigate, and by the help of the Divine Word, and by the guidance of the Divine Spirit, shall endeavor to refute and cast them away from the temple of truth.

Not only the doctrines are objected to, but the terms in which they are usually expressed. The terms "federal head," "legal representative," "original sin," "imputed sin," "natural corruption," and others, are all animadverted upon by those who oppose the orthodox view of the consequences of Adam's first sin. Those who raise these objections insist on a use of Bible terms and Scripture phraseology, and also of terms of ancient and primitive date. They insist that these terms objected to are neither Bible terms nor of ancient times. Suppose we should concede that none of them are exact phrases of the Bible, and that they are all of recent date. We are persuaded that this concession would by no means condemn their use as theological terms. It would by no means follow that they should be repudiated. It would by no means follow that they are misleading, or that the doctrines set forth in their use are unscriptural. Perhaps these terms are not absolutely necessary to the correct statement and proper defense of the

doctrines with which they are connected, and in whose elucidation they are employed. As mere terms, perhaps, the theological world could dispense with their use without any great detriment; but as mere terms of language, they are innocent, correct, clear, dignified, and comprehensive. As theological terms, they are perhaps as appropriate and scriptural as any that could be chosen. In truth, there are none better. We have never yet seen a system of theology which confined itself exclusively to the use of Scripture terms and words. Those who have insisted most on an exclusive use of the words of Scripture, when they were discussing doctrines, have been farthest from the exclusive use of the words of Scripture when formulating a creed. Arians and Pelagians are as far from an exclusive use of Scripture language as any writers known in the history of the Church. They use such terms as "imitating Adam," "voluntary acts," "habits," "concreated," etc., which we are sure are not Bible terms.

But let us examine those terms objected to separately, together with the doctrines which they embody.

FEDERAL HEAD AND LEGAL REPRESENTATIVE.

When we investigate the subject we find that the objection urged against this phraseology grows out of opposition to the doctrine taught thereby more than to the phraseology itself. Some authors, while urging what they esteem very serious objections against the term "federal head," yet admit that Adam was the natural head of the race. The Bible is as devoid of the phrase "natural head" as of the phrase "federal head." The federal headship grows, in part at least, out of the natural headship. The admission of the former is a concession of the latter. Adam being the natural head of the race, and being corrupt and sinful when his children proceeded from him, he transmitted to

them, through natural generation, his own corrupt and sinful nature, and so they are all born corrupt and sinful.

John Taylor, Arian as he was, and denying, as he did throughout his book on "Original Sin," that Adam was the federal head and legal representative of his race, nevertheless makes concessions, when expounding the fifth chapter of Romans, which really concede the truth that Adam was the federal head and legal representative of his race. In this exposition he writes the following sentences: "The judicial act which followed Adam's sin took its rise from his one offense alone, and terminated in condemnation." "Men are subject to death, not from their own personal sins, but from the sin of Adam." "Death must be understood to have passed upon all mankind, not for that they all have sinned really, properly, and personally, but they have sinned, are made sinners, are subjected to death, through the one offense of one man—that is, of Adam." "It is evident that the apostle draws a comparison between Adam and Christ: something that Adam did, and the consequences of that; and something that Christ did, and the consequences of that." "It is quite undeniable that all, all mankind, die; all are mortal; all lose their life in Adam." ("Original Sin," pp. 25, 38, 53, 59, 61.) In these sentences this author says that the apostle makes a comparison between Adam and Christ; that by the one sin of Adam all mankind are made sinners; that condemnation resulted by a judicial act following the sin of Adam; and that all are subjected to death, not for personal sins, but the alone sin of Adam. By death, however, he means only temporal death, and by being made sinners he means only being subjected to temporal death. But he has here said all that we have said, or care to say, when we set forth the federal headship and representative relation of Adam to his posterity, except that we teach that Adam's sin was visited upon his posterity, not

only in temporal death, but in actual spiritual death, and a liability to eternal death; and that by being made sinners we mean more than being subjected to temporal death. If physical death was visited upon all, and judiciously passed and announced upon all for Adam's sin, as Taylor here teaches, why not spiritual death as well? What principle of philosophy or of ethics would be violated or invaded by the falling of spiritual death upon his posterity for his sin that would not be equally violated and invaded by temporal death falling upon them for his sin? We hesitate not to answer, None whatever.

Say what we may, descendant ever so learnedly, make ever so many pleas for justice, go into ever so many ecstasies in admiration of goodness, and parade ever so many difficulties, after all, and in defiance of all, there is a Scripture view of the case which recognizes Adam's posterity as being in him at the time he sinned, and acting in and by him. "Levi also, who receiveth tithes, paid tithes in Abraham. For he was yet in the loins of his father, when Melchisedec met him." (Heb. vii. 9, 10.) There was a sense in which the apostle could and did say that Levi paid tithes by Abraham while he was yet in the loins of Abraham. In the same sense, and in like manner, it may and should be said that Adam's posterity, who were in his loins when he transgressed the law of God, sinned in or by him. It has been said there "is a constituted oneness of the human race," and this we emphasize; but this does not mean that Adam and his posterity are "one person." Adam's posterity sinned in him as their head. This we maintain; but it does not mean that they "participated individually in the first sin." The mere fact that Adam's posterity were in his loins does not, of course, prove that "their nature contracted a propensity to sin," but being in his loins, they proceed from him with a corrupted or sinful nature, and by

virtue of this sinful nature there is in them from their birth a propensity to sin. The posterity being naturally in Adam, and legally considered and provided for as in him at the time he sinned, as we have shown they were, it is strictly true that naturally and legally they sinned in and by him. This is manifest and conclusive.

ORIGINAL SIN.

What reasonable objection can be alleged against this phrase? The word "original," simply as a word, is proper and unexceptionable, and so is the word "sin." The phrase is used in allusion to Adam's first transgression, which was the first human sin, and the origin of moral evil, so far as moral evil pertains to the human race. It is also used to designate the corruption natural to the offspring of Adam. Perhaps there are no other words in the language which could so concisely and forcibly set forth the whole subject as these two words, "original sin." What phrase could be substituted for this? It certainly makes no special difference when or by whom this phrase was first brought into use. If it properly expresses and presents the doctrine it is intended to embody and formulate, even though the doctrine itself be false, it is frivolous to object to it as a phrase, originate when or by whom it may. It has become a standard phrase, having been almost universally adopted by the Christian Church. This is a testimony in its favor.

IMPUTED SIN.

This is a term against which, together with the term "imputed guilt," objection is alleged. By imputed sin is meant the sin of Adam imputed to his offspring. "Imputed" is a Bible term, and "imputed sin" is a phrase sufficiently concise and comprehensive to serve admirably the purpose for which it is used. What we have said in advocacy of the term "original sin" may be said also in defense of the

term "imputed sin." We would not hesitate to give up this, and all the other terms objected to, if better could be substituted for them. We are no sticklers for mere phraseology; but the doctrines taught through the use of these phrases are fundamental, and cannot be renounced. Vital and scriptural doctrines must not be expunged from the creeds of Christendom out of regard for a sneer at a phrase. It is much easier to scoff at phraseology than to frame a logical argument or produce a sound reason.

Before dismissing the phrases "original sin" and "imputed sin," and while connecting with them the phrase "natural corruption," we must discuss the question, What is sin?

Does the true nature and proper definition of sin authorize us to call the inherent corruption of nature sin? Can we properly call the native corruption of the heart sin? Can we predicate sin of character? Can we apply the term sin to the depravity of character? or does it apply exclusively to an *act* by which the law of God is violated? Is sin an *act*, and not a state? an *act*, and not a quality? Here are the points involved in the question, What is sin?

There are various passages of Scripture which indicate different kinds and degrees of sin, but there are none which say or intimate that nothing is sin but an act, neither any which say sin is nothing but a voluntary act. A sinful act is sin. Some acts of some creatures are sinful. An act to be sin or sinful must be the voluntary act of a moral agent, and it must be an act which violates a moral law authorized and in force. An act coerced is subject to no blame, and entitled to no praise, so far as the party coerced is concerned. An act done without the consent and choice of the will of the actor, if considered his act, is without moral quality. If this act has any moral quality, it derives it from the part taken in it by the being who forced the non-consenting actor to its performance. "Sin is the transgression

of the law." This is a Scripture definition, and no one can call it in question, but it is never once intimated that transgression, or sin, exists exclusively in an act. Any state, or condition, that is repugnant to the law of God is sin. Any thing impinging the law of God, whether it be condition, thought, desire, principle, or act, is sin. "All unrighteousness is sin." This is the word of Scripture. "The thought of foolishness is sin." So taught Solomon. "The carnal mind is enmity against God." Surely enmity against God is sin. Surely a carnal mind is not an act, but is a condition, or character, of nature.

The apostle Paul calls the inherent nature the corrupt disposition, and the unrighteous propensities belonging to all unregenerate persons, sin. He writes to the Romans: "But I am carnal, sold under sin. For that which I do, I allow not: for, what I would, that do I not; but what I hate, that do I. If then I do that which I would not, I consent unto the law that it is good. Now then it is no more I that do it, but sin that dwelleth in me. For I know that in me (that is, in my flesh) dwelleth no good thing: for to will is present with me; but how to perform that which is good I find not. For the good that I would, I do not; but the evil which I would not, that I do. Now if I do that I would not, it is no more I that do it, but sin that dwelleth in me." (Chapter vii. 14-20.)

By such terms as "that I do not" and "that do I," the apostle directly refers to deeds or acts. By such terms as "carnal" and "sin that dwelleth in me," he cannot possibly make allusion to deeds or acts. In these he alludes to that which pertains to being, nature, character, tempers, dispositions, that which is in the man. An act cannot dwell in any one: sin does dwell in an unregenerate man; therefore something else is sin besides an act. The corruption and wickedness natural to the human heart since the apos-

tasy of Adam is certainly out of harmony with the law of God, and antagonistic to God himself, and consequently is sin. For whatever is antagonistic to God and his law is sin. "The human heart, born corrupt, is sinful. Moral corruption is sin, whether it be inborn or superinduced by a life of profligacy. It is insisted by some that whatever is natural to us, that whatever is born in and with us, cannot be sin. "If we come into the world infected and depraved with sinful dispositions, then sin must be natural to us; and if natural, then necessary; and if necessary, then no sin." (Taylor.) "Make this inherited disease, or disorder, or depravity, as great and as terrible as you please; make it, if you choose, the inexhaustible source or occasion of all the world's overflowing and frightful wickedness; but do not call it sin. . . . We could not help coming into the world with a fallen and depraved nature; and hence, however fearful the fall and depravity, this makes us an object of God's compassion only, and not of his wrath and indignation." "It is of the very essence of sin that it be an exercise of the will." "We say then that there never can be virtue or vice in the breast of a moral agent prior to his own actings and doings." (Bledsoe.)

It is a strange error which makes virtue synonymous with choice or obedience, and vice synonymous with choice and disobedience. It is an equally strange error which makes love and obedience synonymous. Obedience, instead of being love, is the result of love and the evidence of its existence.

Men may not be entitled to any praise for any gift bestowed upon them by the Divine power, and, likewise, they may not be obnoxious to any condemnation for the want of any gift withheld by the Divine hand; but a being is good if it is good, and may be declared good for moral goodness in it, and admired for this, whether the moral goodness was

concreated or otherwise; and a being is wicked if it is wicked, and may be declared vicious for moral degeneracy in it, whether the moral degeneracy was inborn or acquired by acts of profligacy.

A necessitated volition is verily impossible, and God cannot impart holiness to an adult sinner, or make a new creature of him without his consent and choice, but a concreated holiness is not an absurdity nor an impossibility. God cannot force sin upon an intelligent moral agent, but then a child descending from fallen and depraved Adam may be born with a corrupt and sinful nature. Necessity has nothing to do with innate depravity or indwelling sin, and there is nothing more fallacious than the arguments which join the two together. The scheme of necessity may be based on a false psychology, directed against a false issue, supported by false logic, fortified by false conceptions, recommended by false analogies, rendered plausible by a false phraseology, originate in a false method, and terminate in a false religion; but this has nothing to do with the doctrine of indwelling sin, and by no means refutes this doctrine.

The declaration that depravity, incident upon the fall and natural to us, makes us an object of God's compassion, and not of his wrath, is in direct conflict with the Scriptures. This depravity may make us the object of God's compassion, as there can be no compassion, as well as no wrath, where there is no sin, but it makes us also an object of God's wrath. The apostle tells us of those who "were by nature the children of wrath." It is by nature, and not by practice, that they are declared to be children of wrath. They may, in fact, have been children of wrath also by practice, but the wrath is declared to be by nature. By nature, corrupted and depraved, they fell under the wrath of God and the curse of the law.

Instead of the concupiscence of the heart being the prod-

net of vicious acts and evil habits, the vicious acts and evil habits of life proceed from the natural lusts, evil desires, and vicious propensities of the heart. "Every man is tempted, when he is drawn away of his own lust, and enticed. Then when lust hath conceived, it bringeth forth sin." "Out of the heart proceed evil thoughts, murders, adulteries, fornications, thefts, false witness, blasphemies." Wicked deeds, such as are mentioned in this last text, defile and condemn the man who performs them. This cannot be denied at all; but the heart is wicked antecedent to these and all other acts, and if this were not the case then wickedness would not be universal; among the millions in the various nations and generations of men there would be some who would be innocent and righteous. If, as has been said, newborn infants have no character at all, then they would be just as likely to make good men and women as bad ones; and there would surely, once in awhile, one be found who would be innocent, righteous, and pious without any regeneration and sanctification of the Spirit.

There is a real difference between imputed sin and individual acts, or sin committed in person. There is as wide a difference between imputed sin and the individual acts of responsible agents as between any two things which could be mentioned. Confounding the two, a thing often done, leads to the utmost confusion and the gravest errors. Parties ignoring this distinction give us caricature representations of the doctrine of imputed guilt. They represent the doctrine of our sinning in Adam as making us and Adam one moral person, and as making us personally present and personally consenting to and personally participating in Adam's act. Then, having given this caricature representation of the doctrine of imputed sin, these parties will propose to refute the doctrine by the claim of an *alibi*, and by the impossibilities of naming the sins, as we name personal

transgressions, which we committed in Adam. Adam and his posterity do not constitute one person, but they are of one race. His posterity were not personally present, personally consenting to and participating in his sinful act, but as a race he and they are one, and they were in him, and acted by him, he being their head and representative. New-born infants have never, in their own proper persons, committed acts which are sinful. So far as any thing they have done as individuals, they are without sin, and are not sinners. The boast of an *alibi*, and the boast of having done nothing which like personal sins can be named, is therefore a mere sophistry, and a useless subterfuge. If the apostle includes us in "all" and "many" when he says, "By the offense of one judgment came upon all men to condemnation," and, "By one man's disobedience many were made sinners," then we did sin in Adam, the boasted *alibi* to the contrary notwithstanding; and Adam's act in eating of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil may be named as the sin charged against us, or imputed to us.

There is such a thing as individuality, as well as what we shall name communality. A man, constituted of a body of flesh and of a living soul, is an actual and distinct person. Individual existence is the basis of the existence of the body politic. The aggregated existence of human kind is found alone in the persons thereof. The human family is constituted of distinct and actual persons. In connection with this personality is accountability; and where there are no persons there are no responsibilities whatsoever. But personal existence and personal accountability do not destroy the aggregated features of human society, nor the fact that God deals with the human family as a body. Communality is as true as personality. There is a community, family, stock, or race, as certainly as there are individuals. The word "man" applies to the race as such, including

Adam and his entire posterity as directly and as distinctly as it applies to persons. The Bible refers as plainly to the race as an aggregated body of human beings as it does to any one person. Its references to the race as a body are as manifest as are its references to Abel, Seth, Noah, David, Peter, or Paul. God takes special account of individuals, holds them responsible for their deeds, and punishes them for their transgressions. Likewise he takes account of the body politic, holds the nation responsible for its conduct, and punishes the race for its crimes. In proof of this we need only refer to the history of Israel, Nineveh, Babylon, Egypt, and the rest. God, in his grace and providence, provides for and blesses individuals; but in his grace and providence he also provides for and blesses the race. In proof of this we give these passages: "Behold the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world." "God so loved the world that he gave his only-begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life." The text does not say that God so loved Noah, Job, and Daniel, Peter and John, that he gave his Son, but he so loved the world, and sent him into the world that the world through him might be saved. The atonement made by Jesus Christ is a provision made for the world, made for the human family—the whole race. Instead of this atonement being prescribed for and limited to certain persons, it is for the race, so that Christ is really the propitiation for the sins of the whole world.

This doctrine of individuality and of communality lays the foundation for the distinction of original sin and of personal sin.

This leads us to an investigation of the eighteenth chapter of Ezekiel. It is asserted that the doctrine of imputed sin is antagonistic to the express language of this portion of Ezekiel's prophecy. There was a proverb in the land

of Israel which said: "The fathers have eaten sour grapes, and the children's teeth are set on edge." The Lord God took up a dealing with Israel and said unto them, through Ezekiel: "As I live, ye shall not have occasion any more to use this proverb in Israel." And in this connection, amongst many other things of similar import, he says: "The soul that sinneth, it shall die. The son shall not bear the iniquity of the father, neither shall the father bear the iniquity of the son; the righteousness of the righteous shall be upon him, and the wickedness of the wicked shall be upon him."

A patient investigation of this portion of the word of God will amply repay the toil necessary to a correct understanding thereof. It is a most edifying portion of the Divine revelation. The mind of the Spirit is what we wish to know, and after which we must inquire.

This passage cannot be in conflict with the declaration made in the Decalogue: "I the Lord thy God am a jealous God, visiting the iniquity of the fathers upon the children unto the third and fourth generation of them that hate me; and showing mercy unto thousands of them that love me, and keep my commandments." Neither can it be in conflict with the declaration of the apostle: "By the offense of one judgment came upon all men to condemnation." "By one man's disobedience many were made sinners." Any interpretation which ignores these utterances of the apostle and the Decalogue must be false. It is most emphatically set forth in the word of God, and most clearly illustrated in the dispensations of the divine procedure, that God does visit "the iniquity of the fathers upon the children, and upon the children's children, unto the third and to the fourth generation;" and that he "keepeth covenant and mercy with them that love him and keep his commandments to a thousand generations." An illustration of his

visiting the iniquity of the fathers upon the children is found in his dealing with wicked Ahab. For Ahab's wickedness God threatened to bring evil upon his posterity. Ahab heard the threatening and humbled himself. For this God staid his judgments for the time, but said: "In his son's day will I bring the evil upon his house." And the Lord kept this purpose, and Jehoram, Ahab's son, fell under this curse of his father. (See 1 Kings xxi.; 2 Kings ix.) How true it is, "The seed of evil-doers shall never be renowned."

In the interpretation of this chapter of Ezekiel we should not lose sight of the points brought out in it. We must not lose sight of the purport of the proverb, "The fathers have eaten sour grapes, and the children's teeth are set on edge," and what it is which God intends to rebuke in the use made of this proverb. The proverb was used by the Israelites in that day as an assertion of their own personal innocence, and as a denial of the equity of God in the infliction of punishment upon them. The purport of the proverb, as they used it, was that they themselves had committed no sins, that their fathers had sinned, and they were suffering and were being punished for their fathers' sins. They brought charges against God and their fathers, and cleared themselves. God asserted, therefore, in the face of their wicked and unjust charges against him, and their unfounded justification of themselves, that his ways were equal and just; that he did deal with them according to the merits of their own conduct, and that their personal sins entered into the account of the crimes for which he was punishing them. Not only the iniquities of their fathers deserved the punishments they received, but their own personal wickedness merited all they suffered. He asserted that he punished the wicked for their own personal sins, and rewarded the righteous for their own personal obedience. The great

principle of personal desert and merit he did not forget nor violate.

For proof that this is a correct view and sound interpretation of this chapter of Ezekiel, we give a passage from the law of God delivered to Israel. Forewarning the people of the curses which he would visit upon them for their disobedience, and announcing the principles upon which he would deal with them, he says: "And they that are left of you shall pine away in their iniquity in your enemies' lands; and also in the iniquities of their fathers shall they pine away with them. If they shall confess their iniquity, and the iniquity of their fathers, with their trespass which they trespassed against me, and that also they have walked contrary unto me; and that I also have walked contrary unto them, and have brought them into the land of their enemies; if then their uncircumcised hearts be humbled, and they then accept of the punishment of their iniquity, then will I remember my covenant with Jacob, and also my covenant with Isaac, and also my covenant with Abraham will I remember; and I will remember the land." (Leviticus xxvi. 39-42.)

This is a commentary upon the eighteenth chapter of Ezekiel.

A man who does well deserves well, and receives good for so doing, his father's sins to the contrary notwithstanding. The man who does evil deserves evil, and receives ill for so doing, his father's righteousness to the contrary notwithstanding. So that it is most true that there is a sense in which the personal sins of ordinary parents are not visited upon their children who for themselves walk in righteousness, and thus disallow or condemn the deeds of their parents. It is also true that God will not damn in eternity the soul of the son for the sin of the father, if the son does not make the sins of the father his own by walk-

ing in the same. But it is moreover true that there is a sense in which the children fall under the malediction of their fathers' sins. In all this there is no contradiction and no conflict. The eighteenth chapter of Ezekiel is not therefore in opposition to the doctrine of imputed sin or original guilt.

The dispensations of God, with all their variety and wonders, have no greater beauty and excellence than the purity and harmony thereof. The word of God, abounding with poetry, prophecy, miracle, and inspiration, displays no greater perfection than in the consistency of the whole thereof, and the harmony of all its parts. One part of the Bible is consonant to every other part.

CHAPTER VIII.

THE CONSEQUENCES OF THE FIRST TRANSGRESSION OF
THE FIRST MAN.

FURTHERMORE, our opponents, in their objections to the doctrine of original sin, charge that it involves the doctrine of infant damnation. It is insisted that this doctrine maintains that infants, dying in infancy, are lost in hell. Our opponents insist that the doctrine of original sin first originated with St. Augustine, and is a part and parcel of the theory known as Calvinism. To this we respond.

St. Augustine was not the author of the doctrine of original sin. God first taught the doctrine. Apostles, prophets, and patriarchs were all instructed therein.

The doctrines which are peculiarly and exclusively Calvinistic we do not believe. The five points set forth by the Synod of Dort, and maintained by that Synod against the Remonstrants, we do not accept as true. That it may be seen that they have nothing to do with the true doctrine of original sin, we will set down here these five points. We shall give these points in our own way, and in our own language, at the same time following in some measure the language in which they have been authoritatively set forth:

1. God, by an immutable decree, made from all eternity, elected to salvation a certain and definite number of individuals, without any regard to faith, obedience, holiness, or any other good quality in them as a cause or condition of election; and in his good pleasure, for the praise of his glorious grace, he excluded all others, the larger number of

mankind, from saving grace, and reprobated them to eternal punishment, and that without any regard to their unbelief and disobedience.

2. Jesus Christ did not die and make satisfaction for the sins of all men, or of the whole world, but he suffered and died for the elect only.

3. By Adam's fall his posterity lost their free-will, and are now under an unavoidable necessity to do or not to do whatever they do or do not, whether it be good or evil, being thereunto predestinated by the eternal and effectual secret decree of God.

4. God, to save the elect, doth, by the application of his own irresistible power, beget faith in them insomuch that those to whom he gives grace cannot reject the grace; and the rest, being reprobate, cannot accept it.

5. They that have once received this grace can never fall from it, finally or totally, and that notwithstanding they commit the most enormous sins.

These, with the perversions naturally growing out of them, are the points peculiar to the Calvinistic theory. These peculiarly Calvinistic points of doctrine we could consign to oblivion without in the least affecting the doctrine of original sin. These points, set forth and defended by the Synod of Dort, may involve the dogma of infant damnation, as it is called, but the Scripture doctrine of imputed guilt has nothing to do with this dogma or these points. Original sin is not the offspring of Calvinistic necessity and reprobation. The theory of the imputation of Adam's sin to his posterity—he being their federal head and legal representative, making them obnoxious to the penalty of the law, or to death as a consequence and punishment—does not involve the unconditional damnation of infants or adults in hell. Unconditional damnation is rested by those who hold it upon either the decree or foreknowledge of God,

and leaves the non-elect out of the provisions of the atonement.

If there is no such thing as original sin or imputed guilt, then there is no such thing as infant salvation. If infants have no moral character, and are not sinners by virtue of Adam's sin imputed to them, having no sin through their own personal action, they are not sinners at all; and, therefore, those of them who die in infancy cannot be saved. None can be saved but sinners. Christ died only for sinners. We repeat, if infants who die in infancy are not sinners through Adam's sin imputed to them, then they are not sinners at all, and Christ did not die for them, and does not save them. This is an argument which has been brought forth in substance repeatedly, and has never been refuted, and never can be. Here we rest our cause in response to the hue and cry about infant damnation. Our theory is the only one upon which we can predicate the salvation of infants, or, as for the matter of that, the salvation of adults.

In consequence of sin imputed to them, children are sinners, and, being sinners, they are under the full penalty of sin; and were they left where they are thus placed by sin, they would have to endure and suffer the penalty of sin throughout eternity. By the atonement of Jesus Christ made for them, and through the benefits of this atonement applied in the forgiveness of this imputed sin, and in the regeneration of their corrupt and sinful natures, children dying in infancy are relieved from sin and its penalty, and are not damned in hell, but are saved in heaven. Children dying in infancy are not saved because they have not been accounted sinners, and have not been under condemnation, and have not been liable to eternal punishment, but they are saved because they have been retrieved from sin and released from condemnation and punishment.

The charge alleged that the doctrine of original sin involves and maintains the inconsistencies and absurdities involved in and maintained by the doctrines of irresistible grace, absolute necessity, and a partial and limited atonement, which are found in the "five points" of Calvinism, is without the slightest foundation in reason or truth. To the expressions "necessary holiness," "necessary sin," and "created sin," expressions astutely paraded, and often repeated, by our opponents, no meaning whatever can be attached. They are so utterly meaningless that they only indicate how totally absurd are the dogmas of our opponents and the miserable straits to which they are reduced in their endeavors to bolster up their sham conceptions. Original sin has nothing in the world to do with "necessary holiness," "necessary sin," or "created sin," whatever they may be. No responsible Arminian author ever defended the miserable nonsense couched in these expressions so tediously dwelt on by those who fight against the evangelical doctrine of inherited depravity. In order to a correct view of the condition and character of infants, and to properly appreciate the subject, it is necessary to have a correct view and proper understanding of at least one feature of the atonement of Christ, and of justification and of regeneration.

The atonement is a provision and satisfaction made for the race. Christ made atonement for "the sin of the world." As a provision for the race, the atonement is finished and complete. Justification is not of universal nature, including within its jurisdiction the whole race, but is of the nature of a special act and work, of special application done for one single and separate individual. In like manner regeneration is a work done in the single individual. Justification and regeneration have respect only to the individual for whom and in whom they take place.

The atonement made is not justification and is not regeneration, and not every one atoned for is justified and regenerated. The atonement made does not justify the individual, but only makes it possible for him to be justified. The atonement having been made, it is now possible for God, as the apostle states it, to be just and the justifier of the ungodly. Not until an act takes place for the individual as an individual, justifying him, is he justified. The atonement—made and finished, as it is, and standing as a provision, as it does, for the salvation of the race—may, nevertheless, not eventuate in the salvation of every individual thereof. The atonement is a provision and a satisfaction made for all and every one, and will eventuate in the salvation of every person in whom the work provided for by this atonement is accomplished; but certain things must be done for and in the individual before the atonement, made and completed, as it is, can eventuate in the salvation of any particular individual. This is alike true in its application both to infants and adults. This should not be forgotten, nor slightly considered.

Children are born into the world upon the basis of the atonement and within reach of the benefits thereof, the atonement being a universal provision; but as individuals these children, when born, may not yet have received its proposed and proffered blessings of justification and regeneration. Children are never, in any case nor in any event, justified nor regenerated before they have an actual personal existence.

The work of justification and regeneration takes place in the persons of infants, in which it takes place at all, just as in the persons of adults, except that in the case of adults repentance and faith are prerequisites, and in the case of infants these things are impossible, and are not required. The same Spirit that regenerates the adult person regener-

ates the infant, and this regeneration is the same work in the one case and in the other. The same God who justifies the adult justifies the infant, and this justification is the same thing in the one case and in the other. There is no more difficulty or mystery accompanying the work of justification and regeneration in the person of an infant than in the person of an adult. There is as little foundation for the belief that the original sin of the infant has been blotted out before it was born as there is for the belief that the personal sins of the adult were blotted out before he was born.

God has a method founded on general principles by which he dispenses the blessings of salvation. In every case in which salvation is attained certain general principles are recognized and conformed to, and in every such case certain necessary agents are engaged in the work. Certain works and acts which are requisite to salvation are performed in every case and for every individual who attains salvation. Upon the recognized basis of conferring justification and regeneration upon the one and upon the other, God can, with equal facility, justify and regenerate the infant and the adult. The infant is incapable of exercising repentance and faith, and is equally incapable of resisting the will of God and of rejecting the atonement and grace of Christ; and hence it is as much within the principles and methods of the Divine government to justify and regenerate the dying infant without faith and repentance as the adult with them.

Ever and anon, in boldest utterance, it is asserted that the imputation of sin to newborn infants and the punishment of these children for this sin would be an injustice shocking to the better instincts of mankind; and that it would be horrifying to think of God subjecting the posterity of Adam to a liability to eternal death for his one sin,

to which they gave no consent, and about which they were never consulted. In holy horror it is exclaimed, "God cannot be such a monster as to do a thing of that kind, and let not such a charge be alleged against his government!" All this may appear plausible to many minds, and may be popular with superficial thinkers, and may afford opportunity for a display of rhetoric and a vain boast of kind-heartedness and sympathetic emotions; but that is all. There is nothing solid or true in any thing herein contained. "Far be it from God, that he should do wickedness; and from the Almighty, that he should commit iniquity." The Almighty is "a God of truth, and without iniquity; just and right is he." The imputation of Adam's sin to his offspring, and subjecting them to the punishment due to this sin, which punishment connotes eternal death, in no way impinges equity and truth, mercy and justice. Where can be the injustice of propagating a race under the maledictions of sin, under a judicial sentence for sin, when they are also propagated under the provisions of grace potent to release them from all the evils to which they are liable, and bring them to an estate as good and as desirable as any they could have had in the mere absence of an impending penalty?

As Adam sinned and fell, God must either perpetuate the race as a sinful and fallen race, or not perpetuate it at all. It was absolutely impossible for sinful Adam to produce any other than a sinful progeny. The divine law could not do otherwise than condemn sin and sinners wherever found or however produced. It was, therefore, for the divine economy to devise a method for saving sinful and condemned children propagated as such by Adam, or to cut off the race in and with Adam, and thereby prevent their personal existence. The divine economy did the former, and not the latter; and so the whole dispensation is one of

grace and mercy, and not of cruelty and injustice. It is a dispensation which recognizes the existence of sin, and condemns sin and punishes sin, and yet proposes to release and save from sin just so far as can be done under the eternal principles of the divine government and through the power of a divine expedient. The scheme of redemption is a divine expedient. In the divine scheme of human redemption is found the equipoise of justice and goodness, than which a profounder mystery does not exist, than which a more radiant glory is not seen. The warmth and strength of love, the inflexibility of justice, the amiability of goodness, and the equity of truth, all stand forth in the scheme of saving a sinful, fallen, and condemned race.

There is an incapacity of will, and there is an inability for responsible action peculiar to infants, idiots, and lunatics. The existence and effects of sin and the provisions of grace meet in these in recognition of the absence of accountability. It is impossible for newborn infants and very young children to exercise will upon the basis of accountability, because they have not a development and strength of the mental and moral faculties sufficient for accountable choice and action. The same is true of idiots, however advanced in years they may be. More than the bare existence of will is essential to responsible choice and action. Reason and a capacity for a knowledge or perception of right and wrong are essential thereto, with whatever else is necessary to a decision of the mind and the action of the soul. Aside from the inability of will and the incapacity for responsible action, here already named, there is a prostration of the will and an inherent bondage to sin which incapacitate for choosing and doing right. The will, by the fall, has lost its freedom inasmuch that it is inclined only to evil, and is averse to all good. The human soul, in its fallen state, is under bondage to inherent evil, and while

it can choose evil and do wrong, it can never choose good or do right unaided by grace. The statement of the Synod of Dort, that "by Adam's fall his posterity lost their free-will," is most surely true, though the other statement connected with it, that they "are now under an unavoidable necessity to do or not to do whatever they do or do not, whether it be good or evil," is most surely unscriptural and false. The logic of the Synod of Dort is defective. The will may be in bondage to sin, and wholly inclined to evil naturally, and yet not under necessity to do whatever it does. Grace may and does put the soul on a basis of freedom, or at least on a basis whence it is attainable. But naturally the will is enfeebled, and is incompetent to choose good, and is uninclined to do so. In the language of our Article of Religion: "The condition of man after the fall of Adam is such that he cannot turn and prepare himself, by his own natural strength and works, to faith, and calling upon God; wherefore we have no power to do good works, pleasant and acceptable to God, without the grace of God by Christ preventing us, that we may have a good will, and working with us, when we have that good will."

Those who disallow the disability of the human will, and its disinclination to good, assert that if men are disabled in their wills, and are opposed to all good, and are wholly inclined to evil, then they are incapable of performing duty and of regulating their actions by a law commanding good and prohibiting evil, and they are not moral agents.

Though what is here asserted is quite plausible, and is in a measure correct, we cannot accept it in the form it is put as the truth in the case. The Ethiopian cannot change his skin, nor the leopard his spots; no more can a man change his evil nature. Men are wholly unable to pardon their guilt and to wash out their innate depravity. Without extraneous aid men never can break the bondage of sin in which

they are held, or escape the corruption which is in them. Men with unregenerated and wicked hearts are incapable of regulating their lives by the law of God. But the grace of God, as a prevenient endowment, has been given to all men, and this prevenient grace assists the will, and every man is therefore and thereupon a moral agent, and is capable of willing that which is right and choosing that which is good. But, as the apostle teaches in the seventh chapter of the Epistle to the Romans, there is a law in the members of the natural and unregenerate man, even when his mind is enlightened and convicted, which brings him into captivity to the law of sin which is in his members.

There is in every one born into the world a depraved and sinful nature, and this accounts for the universality of sin. Were the race not inclined to sin and in love with it, and were the race naturally free from sin, then the individuals thereof would be, to say the least, just as apt to go right as to go wrong, and under favorable circumstances would go in the right way and do the right thing. There is a beauty and there is a loveliness in virtue and righteousness which would attract and allure some of the individuals of our numerous race if they were naturally free to go in the way of virtue and righteousness. It is *per se* more pleasant to love than to hate, to speak the truth than to speak falsehood, to be honest than to be dishonest, to be benevolent than to be penurious. Sin is hideous in itself, and the way thereof destructive. Therefore if men did not by an evil nature love sin, and were they not in bondage to sin, they would not all follow and commit sin.

But it is said that indwelling sin is not essential to account for the transgressions of men; "that a virtuous act does not require an antecedent virtuous disposition or principle to account for its existence, nor does a vicious act require an antecedent vicious principle to account for its ex-

istence;" that otherwise Adam must have had a sinful nature before he sinned. Dr. Taylor embodies the position in the following utterances: "If you say that lust proceeds from original sin, I ask, Whence then proceeded the lust of our first parents? . . . Adam's nature, it is allowed, was very far from being sinful, and yet he sinned. And therefore the common doctrine of original sin is no more necessary to account for the sin that hath been, or is in the world, than it is to account for Adam's sin. His sin was not from a depraved nature, but from his own disobedient will; and so must every man's sin, and all the sin in the world, how much soever, be, as well as his." (Pages 129, 243, 244.)

We concede at once that a virtuous act does not necessarily require an antecedent virtuous disposition or principle to account for its existence, and that a vicious act does not necessarily require an antecedent vicious principle to account for its existence. We concede at once that Adam's first sin did not proceed from a depraved nature, and that Adam was not sinful, but that he was holy before he sinned. We not only concede this last, but insist on its truth. But then virtuous acts proceed from virtuous dispositions, or principles, and vicious acts from vicious dispositions. Acts partake of the character of the dispositions or principles from which they proceed. They are constituted right or wrong by the nature of the principles from which they flow, as well as by what they are in themselves. An act which violates the law of God, and consequently is vicious in itself, is vicious whether it proceeds from an antecedently virtuous disposition or from an antecedently vicious disposition. So the act of Adam in eating the prohibited fruit was vicious, though previously his disposition was virtuous. An act, virtuous in itself, is vicious when it proceeds from a vicious principle and purpose. The act of praying is in

itself a good act; but a man moved by a vicious disposition and actuated by an unholy purpose prays to God, and the act is vicious and wicked because it proceeds from and is prompted by this vicious disposition and purpose. A man gives an alms to the poor, which is an act right in itself; but the gratification of pride and the attainment of worldly advantage move him to the act, and it is therefore vicious. A virtuous heart acts virtuously, and a vicious heart acts viciously. Every one acts in accordance with his nature and the principles within him. This, it appears to us, needs no argument for its establishing, and lies at the very basis of all philosophy and the nature of all things. "A good man out of the good treasure of the heart bringeth forth good things; and an evil man out of the evil treasure bringeth forth evil things; for out of the abundance of the heart the mouth speaketh." The nature and principles of the man produce his acts, and give to them their character. It is morally impossible for a man who has the nature of Satan in him to do right. It is morally impossible, though not absolutely so, for a man who has the nature of God imparted to him, to sin. "Who-soever is born of God doth not commit sin; for his seed remaineth in him, and he cannot sin, because he is born of God." It is true that one may act contrary to his nature, or original principles, as did Adam, and as did the angels fallen before him; but what we insist on, and what the above texts teach, is that the actions of the individual conform to his principles and flow from them. This is a law well established, and so the innate depravity of the human heart accounts for the universality of sin, and is the source and cause of universal wickedness. Adam, as a man on trial, under the pressure of temptation, sinned once without any innate depravity to induce him. This was only one case of one man. Were the millions of our race without

indwelling sin, and as free to do right as to do wrong, some of the vast multitudes would do right and not do wrong. While we can see how one man might fail to do right under such circumstances, we cannot see why and how so many and every one should fail under such conditions. Men renewed by the grace of God and by the work of the Holy Ghost do right; why do they fail to do right by nature without being renewed, if by nature they are free to do good? Our opponents cannot meet this point otherwise than by a rejection of the doctrine of grace and the renewing work of the Holy Ghost. Hence their position that men do right not by grace, but by nature, and by extraneous influences about them, such as the example of others. But on this hypothesis the scripture above given—"Whoever is born of God doth not commit sin; for his seed remaineth in him, and he cannot sin because he is born of God"—is utterly without meaning. No one should be so silly as to say that "born of God" means an "act of the will," and God's "seed" which remaineth in him who is born of God is nothing else than "the habit formed by a repetition of the acts of the will;" and yet this is the only refuge for our opponents from the force of the plain teachings of the text.

There are two passages of Scripture relied on by our opponents which must be considered at this juncture. One is found in Matthew xviii. 3, and the other in Mark x. 13-15. The first is as follows: "Verily I say unto you, Except ye be converted, and become as little children, ye shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven." It is confidently asserted that this text teaches that children are not naturally sinful; that it vindicates the assumption that newborn infants are without guilt, disease, or moral corruption; that they need nothing done in them or for them, after natural birth, to prepare them for an inheritance in heaven

and admittance there. But we feel sure that Christ had no thought of teaching in this text that newborn infants are actually regenerated and justified, or that they are naturally good. He is teaching the necessity of humility and freedom from worldly ambition. The little child is without worldly ambition, and is an example of humility.

Clement, in his "Instructor," quotes this passage of Scripture, and says that the Lord was "not in that place speaking figuratively of regeneration, but setting before us, for our imitation, the simplicity that is in children."

Among other things which Mr. Richard Watson writes in his exposition on this passage, he says: "Copious parallels have been sometimes formed between the character of little children and true disciples, and as usual in such cases a fertile invention has pushed interpreters beyond the warrant of the text. Our Lord himself explains his own meaning in the next verse: '*Whosoever therefore shall HUMBLE himself as this little child.*' In what, then, does the humility of a little child consist but in freedom from ambition and the desire of wealth and honors? The strifes of men for objects of this kind pass unheeded by the child, and kindle in his bosom no corresponding feelings; he is dead to them. This, in a child, arises not from moral principle, but from immature capacity."

Mr. Fletcher, in his "Dialogue Between a Minister and One of his Parishioners," says: "This passage refers no more to the natural state of children than that where Christ says, 'I will come as a thief,' refers to the dishonesty of a thief. If our Lord affirms that we must become as little children, it is not in natural sinfulness and foolishness, but in 'desiring the sincere milk of the word, as newborn babes desire the breast' (1 Peter ii. 11); in being conscious of our ignorance and helplessness; in submitting to the teaching of our Heavenly Master without unbelieving reason-

ings; and in gladly beginning the spiritual life, as children beginning the natural one." See "Fletcher's Works," Vol. IV., p. 419.

The other passage reads: "They brought young children to him, that he should touch them; and his disciples rebuked those that brought them. But when Jesus saw it, he was much displeased, and said unto them, Suffer the little children to come unto me, and forbid them not; for of such is the kingdom of God. Verily I say unto you, Whosoever shall not receive the kingdom of God as a little child, he shall not enter therein. And he took them up in his arms, put his hands upon them, and blessed them."

That children are subjects of redeeming grace, and objects of God's watchful care and tender mercy, cannot be questioned for a moment, for the Scriptures clearly avouch this truth. That they are redeemed by the blood of Christ, and are entitled to the covenant blessings and covenant-making ordinances of the gospel, admits of no doubt. The Scriptures are sufficiently explicit on these points. In every special covenant which God has ever made with men he included the children of the parties to the covenant. In his covenant with Adam in the garden, when the tree of the knowledge of good and evil was the covenant ordinance, God included the seed of Adam. In his covenant made and established with Noah, the bow in the clouds being the sign of the covenant, God said: "I, behold, I establish my covenant with you, and with your seed after you." In his covenant with Abraham, in which circumcision was ordained as the sign and seal, the language of God was: "I will establish my covenant between me and thee, and thy seed after thee, in their generations, for an everlasting covenant, to be a God unto thee, and to thy seed after thee. . . . This is my covenant, which ye shall keep, between me and you, and thy seed after thee; every man-child

among you shall be-circumcised." When Christ, in the fullness of the gospel dispensation, came to establish a covenant with the nations, of which covenant he ordained baptism as the sign and seal, he said: "Suffer little children, and forbid them not, to come unto me; for of such is the kingdom of heaven." And the apostles, recognizing the fact that the children are embraced in the gospel covenant, and are entitled to the covenant ordinances of the same, preached that "the promise is unto you, and to your children." This passage here under review has been appealed to from the apostolic time as authority for infant baptism, and very properly so, though Christ did not baptize these infants which were brought to him. But then the passage in no way teaches that newborn infants are naturally good, and have no need of regeneration and of justification. Its meaning and significance are just the other way. It teaches that they are subjects of redeeming grace, and therefore in need of all the effects and benefits of that grace. They need regeneration and justification. In the "Dialogue Between a Minister and One of his Parishioners," the parishioner quotes a part of this text to prove that children are not naturally depraved, and Mr. Fletcher replies: "The portion of Scripture you quote establishes what you want to overthrow; for if infants must come to Christ, it follows they are lost sinners through the depravity of their nature, though not yet doubly lost through the corruption of their lives; otherwise they would not stand in need of being brought to the Physician of souls, who 'came to seek and to save [only] that which was lost.' And if our Lord added, 'Of such is the kingdom of heaven'—*i. e.*, the dispensation of the gospel and the Church of Christ—it was to show that infants are in as great want of the gospel, of the advantages of Church-fellowship, and as welcome to them, as persons of riper years." ("Fletcher's Works," Vol. IV., p. 419.)

Do the innocent ever suffer? Are the innocent ever punished under the divine administration? Are all sufferings inflicted as a penalty or as a punishment for sin? Do infants suffer without any reference to a moral law? It is said by those who endeavor to refute the doctrine of original sin that the innocent suffer; that there is suffering under the divine administration which is not a punishment for sin, and that infants suffer without any reference to a moral law. In this connection they assert that afflictions, calamities, and death are means of producing and improving virtue, and that it is a principle of the divine government to impose natural evil or suffering as a means of promoting moral good.

It is quite difficult to avoid confusion when so many points are combined as in the above questions, but with proper attention the truth may be arrived at without any uncertainty or obscurity.

Where there is no moral law there is no transgressor. Where there are no moral law and no transgressor, there is no sin. Where there are no moral law and no transgressor and no sin, there is no guilt. Where there are no moral law and no transgressor and no sin and no guilt, there is no punishment. Where there are no moral law and no transgressor and no sin and no guilt and no punishment, there is no suffering, never was, never will be, and never can be.

It is the purpose of the Lord, in many instances where he visits judgments and calamities, to correct and reform the parties upon whom they are visited, but judgments and calamities are never visited upon any in the absence of sin already existing, and therefore, however the visitation of these may design correction and reformation and the production of positive virtue, these calamities and afflictions are in every case visited as a punishment, and a righteous visitation upon sin. The very declaration which is made

in the matter, "to correct and reform the parties upon whom they are visited," expresses the fact of sin existing. Were there no sin in the case, there would be no occasion to correct and reform.

How could an infant, or any one else, suffer in order to produce virtue and promote moral good, and at the same time suffer without any reference to the moral law? Such a thing is impossible. Is there such a thing as virtue or moral good independent of moral law? Nay, verily.

Suffering and punishment, if not identical, are inseparable. It is impossible to think of suffering without thinking of punishment; and in the absence of sin, there never was and there never can be suffering. God in his justice never can visit afflictions and chastisements upon the beings of a realm where there is no sin. To account one innocent does him no good if he is still held under suffering. Mercy and pity can have no existence in a world of perfect innocence; no more can the mode of producing virtue by the visitation of afflictions and the imposition of sufferings. God could as soon exercise mercy toward an innocent being as visit afflictions and sufferings upon him.

Christians suffer in this life. There is no denying this. "Many are the afflictions of the righteous." "In the world ye shall have tribulation." "Whom the Lord loveth he chasteneth, and scourgeth every son whom he receiveth." Christians have tribulation in the world because the world hates and persecutes, condemns and kills them. Christians endure scourging because God chastises them. But even Christians are under a dispensation in this life which punishes sin. It is a scriptural truth that "to punish the just is not good." It is also said of the Lord: "He doth not afflict willingly, nor grieve the children of men." He must have a cause and a provocation for doing so if he does not do it from his heart; and that cause and provocation is

nothing else than sin. Wherefore a living man has no just ground of complaint and murmuring in his afflictions, for his afflictions are, as they come from God, a visitation or punishment for his sins. "Though affliction cometh not forth of the dust, neither doth trouble spring out of the ground; yet man is born unto trouble as the sparks fly upward." Iniquity, affliction, and trouble are inseparable. Afflictions and trouble come not forth out of the ground, and yet they fall upon man as man, and attend all men in general, because men are born to them as they are born in sin. Many are the afflictions of the righteous, but they come of sin either directly or indirectly.

To the exposition of a few passages of Scripture, which we here group together, we shall devote a short space: "Knowing this, that our old man is crucified with him, that the body of sin might be destroyed, that henceforth we should not serve sin." (Romans vi. 6.) "That ye put off concerning the former conversation the old man, which is corrupt according to the deceitful lusts; and be renewed in the spirit of your mind; and that ye put on the new man, which after God is created in righteousness and true holiness." (Ephesians iv. 22.) "Lie not one to another, seeing ye have put off the old man with his deeds; and have put on the new man, which is renewed in knowledge after the image of him that created him." (Colossians iii. 9, 10.) "So then they that are in the flesh cannot please God." (Romans viii. 8.) "But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God; for they are foolishness unto him; neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned." (1 Corinthians ii. 14.)

These portions of Scripture stand at the very basis of the mission and work of Jesus Christ. The nature and purpose of the whole system of Christ depend upon the interpretation given of these passages. It is remarkable to

what lengths men have gone in an exegesis of these texts in order to evade their true intent and meaning. We have seen a published exposition of Romans viii. 8 and 1 Corinthians ii. 14, in which it is said that the proposition contained in the language, "the natural man," and "they that are in the flesh," "is not a proposition as between two classes in society, but it is a proposition that has respect to the double nature that is within all men." It is further said by the same published exposition that by "the natural man" and "the flesh" is meant "the bodily organization in which reside the appetites and passions," and that by "the spiritual man" is meant "the thinking and emotive man."

From all this we are compelled to dissent. Human language could not be put together so as to more clearly and concisely convey the idea of a class of men in society than is done by the term "they that are in the flesh," and by the term "the natural man." The distinction drawn by each of these terms is clearly of some men from others. The idea of two natures in the same man is in neither of the phrases, and can never be put in either of them. "They that are in the flesh" suggests others who are not in the flesh, and "the natural man" suggests that which is not natural. The idea is nowhere presented in the Scriptures that "the natural man" and "the spiritual man" pertain to and constitute distinct parts of the same individual possessed at the same time; but the idea is that one of these, wherever the man has been both, succeeds and supersedes the other.

Dr. Taylor says that the term "they that are in the flesh" means just the same as "to mind [to choose, to follow] the things [the gratifications] of the flesh," and may be truly paraphrased, "The minding, choosing, and following fleshly gratifications." In his note on "The natural man receiveth

not the things of the Spirit of God" (1 Corinthians ii. 14), he says: "The animal man, the man who liveth the animal life, who maketh the sense and appetitc the law of his actions, receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God." (See "Original Sin," pp. 122, 123.) He makes "to be" the same as choosing and acting, and "to be in the flesh" the same as choosing and acting according to the flesh. It is more than incredible that a man of Dr. Taylor's scholastic attainments could be so biased by his creed, or by any thing else, as to teach that "to be" and "to act" are one and the same thing. It is quite evident that "to be" is not the same with choosing and acting. We say, "This stone is." According to Taylor's paraphrase this is the same as to say, "This stone chooses and acts." Who does not see that there is a difference in a stone existing in its essence and a stone acting? To "mind the things of the flesh" conveys to us the idea of choosing and acting, but "to be in the flesh" conveys to us the idea of state or condition, and not of action.

In expounding the passages in Ephesians and Colossians which refer to and name the old man and the new man, Dr. Taylor says we learn from them "that the 'old man' has reference to the life these Christians had lived while they were heathens. As the 'old man' has reference to a heathenish life, or conversation, so the 'new man' has reference to the life of truth, righteousness, and holiness which they were taught," etc. (See "Original Sin," pp. 180, 181.) In his supplement to this work he says: "God created the 'new man' when he created the gospel dispensation. . . . From all this, I apprehend, we may gather that the 'old man' relates to the Gentile state, and that the 'new man' is either the Christian state or the Christian Church, body, or society." (Pages 154, 155.) He therefore denies that the "new man" is any thing like a new nature given to the individual, or that it is "personal internal holiness,"

and also denies that the "old man" is a corrupt personal internal nature.

When Dr. Taylor reaches a passage of Scripture which has a general allusion, he interprets it as of personal meaning; when he finds one which alludes to the individual, he insists that its references are national and dispensational. By means of this shifting and distorting he keeps always to his creed and athwart the Scriptures. He often contradicts himself and perverts the word of God, but never antagonizes his Arianism.

Perhaps no portion of God's word more specifically and exclusively refers to the personal state and internal principles and nature of the man as he is by natural birth, and as he is by spiritual birth, than do the terms in these texts, the "old man" and the "new man." To tell us that they allude to a Gentile state, a dispensation, or the body politic, is simply to mock us with words, and to seek to blind us with an hypothesis. Such is no better than a vision of the night, the vagaries of a flitting dream.

There is in this phrase, the "old man," something more than the mere adumbrations of truth or the mere scintillations of light. It has something as a basis on which to rest—something which called it into existence, and of which it is characteristic. It is not the mere phraseology of a system based upon an abstraction. It is a phrase of the inspired author which was adopted by him of purpose and not under the influence of fortuitous incidents. It is a phrase of deep and stable significance, and should be retained and held as of divine authority, and guarded in its true intent and significance, if we would have the roots of error dried up beneath and the branches thereof cut off above. The old man is the body of corruption belonging to us. The work of grace does not in its directness destroy the life, but the old nature. The old course of life is, upon

conversion, abandoned, but it is an after effect growing out of the work of grace in the destruction of the old man, or corrupt nature.

“Ye have put off the old man with his deeds.” Here the old man and his deeds are named and clearly distinguished from each other. The apostle would not have been guilty of such tautology as naming the two in the same sentence had he intended by them one and the same thing. Here the old man’s deeds are mentioned as his, but distinct from himself. His deeds are the acts of his life, but they are not the same with himself. Had the apostle meant by the old man the action or conduct of the life, it is quite manifest that he would not have named in the same sentence with the old man his deeds.

“Ye have put off the old man, and have put on the new man.” The old man is before the new man, and the new man is after the old man. The old man is without the new man, and the new man is without the old man. The old man is opposed to the new man, and the new man is opposed to the old man. When the old man is put off, the new man is put on. The old man is bad, the new man is good. The old man is condemned, the new man is approved. The old man is natural, the new man is supernatural. The old man is by natural birth, the new man is by regeneration. The old man is that which is received in birth from natural parents, the new man is that which is received in the birth wrought by the Divine Spirit. The old man is in bondage to sin, loves and commends it, and has no proper discernment and appreciation of holiness and truth. Therefore the old man and the new man, or the natural man and the spiritual man, do not exist as two natures in the same individual, but they mark opposing natures which belong to and distinguish two separate classes of men.

As a matter of fact, men are sinners naturally and innately. "The heart is deceitful above all things, and desperately wicked. Who can know it?" It is the heart, not the life, which is here said to be "deceitful and wicked." What is the heart if it is not that which naturally belongs to a man, and is part and parcel of his being? What are "the lusts of the flesh" and "the desires of the flesh and mind" but the lusts and desires which inherently belong to us? Every individual in every nation, tribe, and generation is a sinner. Jews and Gentiles, one and all, are under sin. "The imagination of man's heart is evil from his youth." "There is none righteous, no, not one; there is none that understandeth, there is none that seeketh after God. They are all gone out of the way, they are together become unprofitable; there is none that doeth good, no, not one." So says the divine record.

CHAPTER IX.

THE CONSEQUENCES OF THE FIRST TRANSGRESSION OF
THE FIRST MAN.

THIS chapter shall be devoted to the consideration of the subject of eternal death. Is there such a thing as eternal death? And if there is, what is it? This subject we discuss here in full, and in its connection with the consequences of the first sin of the first man. All sin and all penalty connect with Adam's sin. Pelagians, Arians, and Unitarians, all rejecting the doctrines of original sin, and holding that Adam's fall was a blessing and not a curse, teach that sin is not a curse, and that God sends every man into the world under his blessing, and not under his curse. Universalists reject, with the above-named parties, the dogma of original sin and innate depravity, and carry the principles held by these parties to their final and ultimate conclusions. In so doing, they deny that God was angry with the race, and in order to appease his own wrath and satisfy his own justice, sent his Son into the world to die for men. They deny that Christ's death was intended to appease God's wrath. The doctrine of suffering for sin, and of eternal punishment for sin, they hold to be a cunningly devised fable. That it was any part of Christ's mission to save men from an endless hell, they most positively deny, for they maintain there is no such place as an endless hell to be saved from. They teach that man cannot commit an infinite sin, nor violate an infinite law. This is simply building upon Pelagian and Arian principles, and pushing these principles out to their own proper and ultimate conclusions.

Searching for the truth and following the Scriptures, we maintain that man violated an infinite law, and committed an infinite sin; that this sin is a curse—as there is infinite sin, there is infinite wrath; that God's wrath abideth on all sin, and upon every sinner; that suffering and punishment are inflicted upon men for sin; and that there is a hell where punishment will be eternal.

Sin separates its author from God, and subjects him to God's wrath eternally. Eternal death is the penalty of sin. Adam's sin, as it was upon him and his posterity, deserved this penalty just as any and every other sin deserves it. All are born under the wrath of God, and liable to an endless hell.

To say that man cannot commit an infinite sin, and cannot violate an infinite law, is simply to say that man cannot sin. Sin is the transgression of the law of God, and the law of God is infinite. If there is such a thing as sin in existence, then the infinite law has been violated, and there is infinite sin. If there is not such a sin, then we need not concern ourselves about the subject. The Bible has much to say about sin, and always in condemnation of it.

Here we are going to consider sin as it is, with its penalty, *per se*. We will consider it in the abstract without any expiation or atonement. We will consider it with Christ left out of the subject. For the time, we will meet the Universalist on his own ground, and show him the subject within his own intrenchments. We shall be careful, however, to set forth, from this point of observation, the truth as it is in the word of God, and in Jesus Christ.

Sin, once existing, exists forever. Guilt, once incurred, is eternal, abstractly considered. Sin can never change its nature, can never terminate itself, can never eventuate in the pardon of its own guilt. Sooner could a kingdom be divided against itself and stand.

Again, obedience can never abolish sin, or in any measure expiate or atone for it. One crime existing, and the law is violated, and the full penalty is in full force, and no after obedience can satisfy for this one sin. The obedience of the after life may be perfect, but it will avail nothing for the sins of the past. A moral agent guilty of a breach of the law can never satisfy for that breach of law by any obedience he can render. The law says, "Thou shalt not covet." A breach of this commandment can never be mended by any after compliance, however ready, long, or full. Obedience admits of no supererogation. Obedience is not satisfaction, and it can never appease the claims of a violated law. An eternity of obedience can never remove or mitigate one sin, though that sin was committed in a moment.

Moreover, repentance itself can never change the character of sin, or in the slightest degree ameliorate the condition of the sinner. Streaming tears might flow through the ages; griefs and groans might exercise and agonize the soul stained with guilt to the latest cycles of eternity, without in the least degree atoning for the sin or relieving the case. Repentance which wrestles alone in the contest with sin is doomed to an endless defeat, and will have its existence alone in desperation and despair. Repentance, instead of satisfying for sin, instead of atoning for sin, instead of removing the guilt of sin, will as long as it continues stand a concession of the existence of sin, and a confession of the eternal demerits thereof. It stands as a witness and as a judge, attesting the crime and affixing the penalty.

And yet again, suffering, however varied, however extensive, or however long submitted to, cannot in any wise relieve the guilt or annul the sin once existing. Punishment can never annihilate sin, nor exhaust its guilt, nor in any measure relax the penalty due thereto. Punishment is

penalty, or the infliction of penalty, and is not expiation, nor satisfaction, nor substitution, nor release, nor annihilation. Coming upon the sinner as the consequence of sin, as the just desert and wages thereof, punishment can never eliminate sin, remove guilt, or satisfy violated law. Punishment, to be commensurate with sin, must be infinite, must be eternal. Sin deserving punishment for the shortest possible time must deserve it forever. The sin is no more changed or atoned for after the punishment of an hour or a thousand years than when the sin first existed and the punishment first began. If you are going to meet the nature, demands, and deserts of sin by punishment, you must punish it forever and ever. If sin requires and deserves to be punished at all, then it requires and deserves to be punished eternally. If God can desist from punishing sin eternally, then he can desist from punishing it at all. To talk of its being unjust to hold men under the condemnation of sin eternally, and to punish them everlastingly, is to talk unphilosophically and unwisely. It is as unjust to punish sin one hour as it is to punish it always.

Yet once more. The law of God can never release from sin. The law can never arrest the penalty, or wipe out the offense. It has neither power nor authority on this side. It can command, and enforce, and execute against sin. "The sting of death is sin, and the strength of sin is the law." Death is brought forth by sin, and there is no law that can give life or release from this death. So far forth as law works, death is eternal.

And finally. God, in his absolute nature and perfections—a God of truth, justice, holiness, goodness, and love—and under the requisitions of his law, which law is like himself, cannot do any thing else than punish sin. He could no more pardon sin upon mere authority vested in himself than he could lie or deny his own nature. Sin is contrary to the

will of God, and in opposition to him. How could he, without any condemnation of sin, release from its penalty? To do so would be to put good for evil and evil for good.

There is such a thing as the anger of God, or the wrath of the Almighty. Than God's wrath nothing is more prominently presented in the Scriptures. The doctrine that the wrath of God abideth on sinners is as inevitably taught therein as that there is a God and that there are sinners: "God is angry with the wicked every day" (Ps. vii. 11); "The wrath of God abideth on him that believeth not the Son" (John iii. 36); "The wrath of God is revealed from heaven against all ungodliness and unrighteousness of men" (Rom. i. 18); "Because of these things cometh the wrath of God upon the children of disobedience" (Eph. v. 6). Anger, or wrath, we are told, is a passion attributed to God in accommodation to the capacities and comprehensions of men. Possibly so; it is, nevertheless, something originating in God and emanating from him. In one sense, wrath in the Almighty is not such a passion as it is in men: in men, anger often rises without any provocation, and in such instances is wrong. God never indulges anger, nor sends forth wrath under any such circumstances, nor in any such way. God hates only that which is hateful, and is angry only with that which is wrong. Anger, so far as it is rightfully excited and properly indulged, is the same in man and in God. If we may conclude that anger is a passion improper and impossible to the Almighty, we may with the same propriety conclude that mercy is a passion improper and impossible to him. Anger, or wrath, is not an attribute of God as justice and holiness are attributes of his. Neither is mercy an attribute of his, as are love and goodness. Mercy is a mere passion, if you wish to call it such, emanating from God's love and benevolence, and exercised by God toward

offenders. Anger, too, is a passion emanating from God's justice and holiness, and exercised by God toward and upon sinners. Had there been no sin, there had been no mercy in and from God, as there had been no wrath in and from him. Why will the Universalist boast of the mercy of God, which is everlasting, and forget and ignore his wrath, which is revealed from heaven against all unrighteousness and ungodliness of men, and which abides on him who is wicked and unbelieving forever?

The exercise of mercy, and the bestowment of pardons provided for in human governments, can have no parallel in God, can find no criterion in his government, and can be no criterion for him. Human clemency has its origin in human weakness. Civil rulers and judicial officers are not possessed of omniscience nor of omnipotence. In the administration of human law and government, mistakes may be made: laws may not be properly adjusted; they may be harsh, unreasonable, and cruel; testimony may be deceptive or wholly false; the innocent may be condemned, and the penalty, even where there is guilt, may be too severe. In these human and civil imperfections originates the necessity of human clemency in judicial administration. The prerogative to pardon, lodged with the head of the human government, is based on the imperfections of human institutions and human administrations. No imperfection adheres in God, and hence there is no necessity for such imperfections in his government as clemency and pardon. He is never deceived, nor his laws out of poise. He is omniscient and omnipresent, and his laws just and good. How absurd to infer, from what man in his weakness and impotence does, what God should and will do!

We have seen, as appears above, that in the nature of the case, without Christ, there is for the sinner no escape from the punishment of sin, or from eternal death. The subject

must now be looked at in its connection with Christ and the provision he has made for salvation. The principles we have brought out and advocated above are equally true, and alike applicable in the presence of Christ and his mediation and in the absence thereof. The true nature of the mission and achievements of Christ is found in alliance with the principles above developed and maintained.

Of Christ and his work, in every particular, Universalists maintain false views. They deny that Christ ever was the very and eternal God, of one substance, power, and eternity with the Father. They insist that the atonement known to the Bible is not a "satisfaction made to divine justice by an innocent Substitute, on behalf of the guilty sinner—a satisfaction consisting in Christ bearing in his own person the punishment due to the sins of men, and suffering in the room and stead of the sinner the penalty of the divine law. The word atonement means simply reconciliation, and the sinner was the recipient thereof, not Jehovah. (See "Salvation and Damnation," by L. F. W. Andrews, pp. 219, 227.)

Rejecting as false all these positions of the Universalists, we maintain that

1. Christ is the Son of God, is very and eternal God, of one substance, power, and eternity with the Father.

2. That he took upon himself human nature, and died the just for the unjust.

3. He died to appease God's wrath, to expiate sin. The expiation of sin involves as much the reconciliation of God to man as it does man to God.

4. Jesus has, by his death, made atonement for the sins of all men, and all men will, through this atonement, attain to the resurrection of the body.

All this is plainly declared in the Scriptures: "And I saw, and bare record that this is the Son of God" (John i. 34);

“I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God” (Acts viii. 37); “And straightway he preached Christ in the synagogues, that he is the Son of God” (Acts ix. 20); “For the Son of God, Jesus Christ, who was preached among you by us, even by me and Sylvanus and Timotheus, was not yea and nay, but in him was yea” (2 Cor. i. 19); “In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God” (John i. 1); “Who, being in the form of God, thought it not robbery to be equal with God” (Phil. ii. 6); “And the Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us” (John i. 14); “But made himself of no reputation, and took upon him the form of a servant, and was made in the likeness of men; and being found in fashion as a man, he humbled himself, and became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross” (Phil. ii. 7, 8); “For Christ also hath once suffered for sins, the just for the unjust, that he might bring us to God, being put to death in the flesh, but quickened by the Spirit” (1 Peter iii. 18); “For when we were yet without strength, in due time Christ died for the ungodly” (Rom. v. 6); “Wherefore in all things it behooved him to be made like unto his brethren, that he might be a merciful and faithful high-priest in things pertaining to God, to make reconciliation for the sins of the people” (Heb. ii. 17); “We have an advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous; and he is the propitiation for our sins; and not for ours only, but also for the sins of the whole world” (1 John ii. 1); “There shall be a resurrection of the dead, both of the just and unjust” (Acts xxiv. 15); “For the hour is coming, in the which all that are in the graves shall hear his voice, and shall come forth; they that have done good, unto the resurrection of life; and they that have done evil, unto the resurrection of damnation” (John v. 28, 29).

Observe here, they that have done evil shall come forth

to the resurrection of damnation. How could this be, if there is no damnation after the resurrection and in a future state? This question answers itself. As there are dead persons, who did evil when living, and who are coming forth in the resurrection at the last day to damnation, there is suffering and damnation in the future state after the resurrection.

Salvation has been proposed and suspended upon conditions—conditions that can be complied with and which can be rejected. Every condition involving contingency, the contingency of acceptance and rejection, declares and sustains the dogma of liability to eternal death. Every scripture which teaches the probability or possibility of the rejection of Jesus by man teaches the doctrine and authorizes the belief that the rejecter of the Son of God will be punished with eternal death. Salvation being offered for acceptance and suspended upon conditions, a refusal to accept and a failure to comply must, beyond all doubt, result in a state such as would inevitably accrue to the sinner were there no salvation provided and offered—a state of condemnation and misery. “He that believeth and is baptized, shall be saved; but he that believeth not, shall be damned.” (Mark xvi. 16.) Here is salvation on the condition of faith, and here is damnation on the persistence in unbelief. Salvation and damnation are antipodal and co-extensive in their terms. If salvation here includes a future state—and it surely does—so does damnation. If salvation here hangs between unbelief and faith—and it does, beyond all question—so does damnation. You cannot suspend salvation between faith and unbelief without at the same time suspending damnation likewise. This is demonstration itself. It is impossible to have a contingency that involves the possibility of salvation that does not at the same time involve the possibility of damnation. “He that

rejecteth me, and receiveth not my words, hath one that judgeth him: the word that I have spoken, the same shall judge him in the last day." (John xii. 48.) He who rejects the word and gospel of Jesus the Son of God in this life shall in the last day, at the end of time, be judged and condemned by that same word and gospel.

"For I say unto you, That except your righteousness shall exceed the righteousness of the scribes and Pharisees, ye shall in no case enter into the kingdom of heaven." (Matt. v. 20.) Here is an unmistakable condition for entrance and abode in heaven—a condition which requires in every event, and in every case, a better righteousness than that of the scribes and the Pharisees. This text, containing this condition, is therefore emphatic in its assertion that the scribes and Pharisees, among the Jews and of the Saviour's time, should not be permitted to have an inheritance in heaven. Final exclusion from heaven certainly consigns to endless perdition. Never to enter the kingdom of heaven, from a want of the necessary righteousness, is certainly to be adjudged to eternal death. The word of Jesus Christ will most surely exist forever unchanged and true. Throughout the ages of eternity will be read the fearful and living words of Jesus: "For I say unto you, That except your righteousness shall exceed the righteousness of the scribes and Pharisees, ye shall in no case enter into the kingdom of heaven;" and while these words exist the scribes and Pharisees therein named shall have no place in heaven, but be shut out in utter darkness. No exclamations of horror, nor eulogies of mercy, nor fanciful parades of goodness, nor any thing else, can obliterate these words of the Son of God, or change the doom of those here named.

Sin existing and never forgiven consigns to condemnation eternally, and this is death—eternal death. Christ assures us there is a sin which hath never forgiveness. Who com-

mits this sin abides under condemnation evermore. "Wherefore I say unto you, All manner of sin and blasphemy shall be forgiven unto men; but the blasphemy against the Holy Ghost shall not be forgiven unto men. And whosoever speaketh a word against the Son of man, it shall be forgiven him; but whosoever speaketh against the Holy Ghost, it shall not be forgiven him, neither in this world, neither in the world to come." (Matt. xii. 31, 32.) The Universalist, when he comes to this passage, resorts to the dodge of a refined criticism on the Greek word *αιων*. But this criticism will by no means serve the purpose for which it is brought. Suppose the Greek word, *αιων*, here translated *world*, does sometimes mean age and dispensation, this does not affect its use and meaning here. It is admitted on all hands that the word "denotes duration or continuation of time," and that it "signifies any thing ancient, which has endured, or is to endure, for a long period." The Greek lexicon says: "*Αιων* (fr. *αι*, *ever*, and *ων*, *being*), eternity; an age, life; duration, or continuance of time; a period; a revolution of ages; a dispensation of Providence; this world, or life to come." So Christ means to say that this sin shall not be forgiven in this life nor in the life to come—in this world nor in the future world—neither now nor hereafter. But to show still further how futile is the criticism on this word, suppose we leave out the thirty-second verse, which contains this word, altogether, and then it is still declared that *this sin hath never forgiveness*. It was Christ who made this declaration: "The blasphemy against the Holy Ghost shall not be forgiven unto men." He set this forth in connection with and in exposition of his own work for the children of men. There is, therefore, notwithstanding the redemptive work of Christ and the dispensation of the Holy Ghost, a sin which is not forgiven, and will not be forgiven, unto men. We may then conclude that there is a sin more

indelible than that "written with a pen of iron and the point of a diamond," and that we "have heard what the prophets said that prophesy lies."

The Bible, conforming its declarations to sober truth, and its style to divine realities, never names a place or state which has no actual existence; and in its delineations never uses terms calculated to mislead. Terms importing the longest duration are never used in the description of a place or state of brief continuance. The Scriptures everywhere set forth the future punishment of the wicked in the most literal manner, and use the most literal terms in the description of hell. The Bible delineation of hell is most sober and awful. The future duration of hell is commensurate with eternity. A few passages of Scripture upon the subject of the future punishment of the wicked may be given and considered:

"And fear not them which kill the body, but are not able to kill the soul; but rather fear him which is able to destroy both soul and body in hell." (Matt. x. 28.) Here is hell named as a place, and the fate of those who are sent into it described as the destruction of soul and body. This place and the destruction in it must be in the future world, as they are set out in contrast to killing the body, which simple killing of the body can only take place in this world. If we read this passage in Luke, it is still more strikingly manifest that it is in a future state and comes alone after extinction of life here: "And I say unto you, my friends, Be not afraid of them that kill the body, and after that have no more that they can do. But I will forewarn you whom ye shall fear: Fear him, which after he hath killed hath power to cast into hell; yea, I say unto you, Fear him." (Luke xii. 4, 5.)

Those that kill the body, and can do no more, are men—the persecutors of Christians. He who can kill, and then hath

power to cast into hell, is God. The simple killing of the body is here in this present; the casting of soul and body into hell follows the extinction of this present life, and introduces to a future state and fate. This cannot be questioned. And the Universalist, perceiving this, expends all his force in trying to demonstrate that to *destroy* is the same as to *annihilate*.

“Then shall he say also unto them on the left-hand, Depart from me, ye cursed, into everlasting fire, prepared for the devil and his angels.” (Matt. xxv. 41.) Here is the fate of the wicked. The Son of God metes them out their doom by driving them from the judgment-seat, calling them accursed, and sending them into everlasting fire. What could be more specific of the future? What could be more expressive of punishment? What could be more comprehensive in duration? What is more terrible than “suffering the vengeance of eternal fire?” Certainly there is nothing so expressive of its perpetuity as everlasting fire.

“And these shall go away into everlasting punishment, but the righteous into life eternal.” (Matt. xxv. 46.) THESE are distinguished from the righteous, and answer to “them on the left-hand” who are driven away “into everlasting fire.” They “go away” from the Lord; they “go away into punishment,” and they “go away into everlasting punishment.” This passage is clear and comprehensive—as much so as human language will permit it to be. For a passage as much in their favor as this passage is against them the Universalists would give any thing. The best they can do is to depend on negative arguments, and remote and indifferent proofs, as there is not a word in the divine record which intimates the termination of the future punishment of the wicked. This scripture describes what will take place at the end of this present state of things—at the end of this present world—and teaches us that Christ

will then consign the righteous and the wicked to their final habitations, awarding to the one life and to the other punishment. This text goes as far to establish the eternal duration of the punishment of the wicked as it does the eternal duration of the life and happiness of the righteous. In the original text the word, translated *everlasting* in the one case and *eternal* in the other, is the same. The Greek word is *αιωνιον*, answering to the Latin word *eternam*. This word is most literal, and expresses the longest and most absolute duration.

The case of the rich man and Lazarus (Luke xvi. 19–31) has a direct bearing upon the subject of future punishment, and may be adduced as proof in the premises. This narrative, whether you call it parable or history, discloses a future world and exhibits the destiny of those who enter therein. That it points to the future, and that it describes existence and destiny after the termination of this present life, cannot be denied.

“There was a certain rich man. . . . There was a certain beggar, named Lazarus. . . . The beggar died, and was carried by the angels into Abraham’s bosom; the rich man also died, and was buried; and in hell he lifted up his eyes, being in torments.” This tells of existence and condition in this world, and the termination of these followed by existence and condition in another and future abode. This scripture introduces to our notice, with many other points, the doctrine of the rewards and happiness of the good and pious in the world to come. But of the existence of heaven, and of the future bliss of those who are true and holy here, it is not necessary to discourse at this present juncture. Here is future misery, or a man suffering anguish after this life has ceased. Here in this life the rich man was opulent and comfortable all the while. So far as worldly goods and worldly gratifications are attainable and

enjoyable, he was successful and happy down to the hour of his death. But his life here ended, and so did his happiness, and the sources of his happiness. He died. He was buried. He went down into hell. He was in torments. This woe and anguish with which he is tormented are not in this present life. He is dead and buried. His body is unconscious and in the tomb. His soul is in hell—is in the dark and infernal regions beyond the confines of this world—and there he is tormented. The words, “Son, remember that thou in thy life-time receivedst thy good things, and likewise Lazarus evil things; but now he is comforted, and thou art tormented,” demonstrate the punishment and suffering to be in another world, and not in this.

In this scripture the word *hell*, or *ᾅδης*, must refer to and mean not the grave where the body is concealed, but the place where the wicked are sent after death, and where they are punished forever, just as the words *Abraham’s bosom*, or *κολων Ἀβραάμ*, must refer to and mean not the grave where the body is laid away, but the place where the righteous are carried after death and rewarded evermore. These truths cannot be ignored; they cannot be puffed away by sarcasm or criticism. It is useless to say that *ᾅδης*, translated *hell*, means the *grave*, or that the whole narrative is only fiction or parable. If the narrative be only a parable, the truths it sets forth are none the less truths, and the future woe and bliss to which it alludes, and which it delineates, are none the less real. If *ᾅδης* does mean the invisible place, the abode of the dead, the grave, etc., as the lexicons say it does, it nevertheless means *hell*, the place or state of punishment for the wicked after death; and it certainly has that meaning in this place.

That the state of this rich man is fixed and unalterable, and that his punishment in hell, where he is, shall endure without termination or intermission, is put beyond

question by this passage: "And besides all this, between us and you there is a great gulf fixed: so that they that would pass from them to you cannot; neither can they pass to us, that would come from thence."

There is a place in the domain of God in which sinners are shut up after this life to be punished for their iniquities. There is another passage of Scripture so expressive on this subject that it may be introduced here and considered in its bearings. In the book of St. Mark, ix. 43-48, it is written: "And if thy hand offend thee, cut it off: it is better for thee to enter into life maimed, than having two hands to go into hell, into the fire that never shall be quenched: where their worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched. And if thy foot offend thee, cut it off; it is better for thee to enter halt into life, than having two feet to be cast into hell, into the fire that never shall be quenched: where their worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched. And if thine eye offend thee, pluck it out: it is better for thee to enter into the kingdom of God with one eye, than having two eyes to be cast into hell-fire: where their worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched."

From this scripture, which sets forth the truth before our eyes, and by which we are most solemnly admonished, we may learn wisdom betimes. It contains one of Christ's most earnest iterations. It is a most solemn presentation of duty and destiny. Conduct and doom are inseparably linked together for this world and the next. Surely none shall be found bold enough to move his tongue against any of these words of the Master. They present to us eternal life and eternal death in antithesis and in contingent attitudes; one attained, the other escaped; one lost, the other fallen into. While there is a glorious possibility of gaining life, there is awful danger of falling under the doom of eternal death. The indulgence of "the lust of the flesh, and

the lust of the eyes, and the pride of life," is forfeiture of an inheritance in the kingdom of God, and must eventuate in being cast into hell, "where the worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched." He who scandalizes himself by the gratification of his lusts shall be cast into hell, where "worn and wasted with enormous woe" he shall be always dying, yet never dead.

In this text the word *γέενναν* is used in the original, and is the most approved word for designating the place of future woe. The word means "hell, hell-fire, torments of hell." So it is defined by the lexicons. Who can describe the woes that rise through all the realms where devils damned and sinners doomed forever dwell? Jesus the omniscient has here in these awful words of his described the hell and its perpetuity to which lustful sinners shall be sentenced in the world to come. "The worm that never dies!" What heart can bear the thought? what eye endure the sight? "The worm," as Pollok would portray it, "in its writhings infinite," and with its "complicated foldings," "twisting" in and "twisting out in horrid" revolutions! This worm, more awful than poetical fancy can depict it, is to feed upon the lost forever and ever. "The lost shall burn in fire unconsumed, world without end."

The question of annihilation is one which has been connected with the subject of eternal death. It is insisted that the wicked will be annihilated at the last, and that their punishment will cease with the termination of their existence; that this is the punishment and destruction to which they are doomed. It is well to receive instruction, learn wisdom, and correctly understand this subject. Let us see that our words are in righteousness and truth, and that our positions accord with the judgments of God's word. Annihilate means to reduce to nothing, and annihilation is reduction to nothing. Such a thing as annihilation has not

been indicated by the punishments which God has inflicted upon the wicked under human observation. God punishes the wicked in many ways, and with divers judgments, but never has he annihilated any one so far as the issue has been known to us. Individuals and nations has he punished with losses and tortures, but never has there been a case of annihilation so far as human knowledge extends. The Almighty has punished some with natural death, or the termination of the present life, but natural death is not annihilation, nor does it result in annihilation; if it did, then the wicked and the righteous would all be annihilated together, for the righteous fall under natural death as well as the wicked. Cain and Saul, Israel and Gomorrah, were all punished, but none of them annihilated. Sodom and Gomorrah were overthrown—they were even consumed by fire—but they were not annihilated so far as the inhabitants thereof were concerned; for Sodom and Gomorrah, in the inhabitants of these places, will be judged and tested in the last day, when the secrets of all hearts shall be made known. (See Matthew x. 15.)

The word “destroy,” while it sometimes means the same as the word “annihilate,” is far from being the same in its general signification. The word “destruction,” while it sometimes means the same as the word “annihilation,” is far from being the same with it in general signification. The word “destruction” is used to convey the idea of complete overthrow, absolute desolation, utter and eternal ruin—such as the overthrow of empires, the desolation of cities, the subjugation of armies, and the demolition of authority. In many places in the Scriptures “destruction” means the same as “perdition” and “eternal death.” In Matthew vii. 13, “destruction,” *απωλεται*, means eternal death, or the place or state of ruin and misery.

So far as the common sense of mankind can determine

the question of future and eternal punishment, it is both reasonable and just. The common sense of mankind, we are aware, is not authoritative in settling questions of doctrine and principles of government. All issues must be appealed to divine authority and to divine revelation. But for divine teaching mankind would be utterly ignorant of future punishment, and even of future existence. The Bible is therefore the only authority on the point involved. The word of the Lord is precious on this behalf. But we insist that there is nothing abhorrent to an enlightened judgment in the doctrine of punishment for sin, and that there is nothing repugnant to the sense of justice in punishing eternally the soul who has rejected the counsel of God, and, persisting in rebellion, would not have the salvation offered in love and goodness. To abolish punishment for sin is to break down all distinctions of right and wrong, all difference between the holy and the profane, between the clean and the unclean, and to make the good and the bad alike worthy of praise, and alike entitled to reward. This is inconsistent with the very words themselves and the very nature of things, and is shocking to common decency. Wrath and mercy, justice and goodness, combine in a testimony against the everlasting demerit of sin and the eternal infamy of the ungodly. The wicked shall go away into everlasting punishment, where there shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth.

CHAPTER X.

GOD, WITHOUT WHOM AND IN THE REJECTION OF
WHOM THERE IS NO SALVATION.

HAVING proceeded thus far in the discussion of the subject in hand, it is proper to state that hitherto the existence of God has been taken in this discussion as a conceded fact, and his character as well known.

Here, as essentially pertaining to the subject under consideration, it is proper to treat the points involved in the being and perfections of God. There is a God. This is an essential fact in moral conceptions. Without a God there can be no moral principles, no obligations, no rights, no law, no government, and no salvation.

Whence is God? and who and what is he? He is of and from himself. He is self-existent. He is not self-created, which involves an absurdity and an impossibility, but he is "I AM THAT I AM," "Jehovah," existing of himself, eternal, immutable. He is a being with essential essence and personality, and possesses whatever is inseparable from these.

Essence is absolutely essential to existence. In the use which has been made of them, the words "essence" and "being" are of very nearly the same meaning. The word "essence" is used here in the sense of substance. God has an essence, or substance, which is the basis of his being, or existence. He is a being, and not a mere ideal conception. He is not matter, nor is he material; and yet he has a substance, which constitutes his being. He is not so ethereal as to be only an idea, any more than he is so gross as to be mere mat-

ter. It is very difficult, when we divest our minds of the idea of matter, to conceive of essence, or substance, which constitutes real existence; and yet we must do so, if we would have a proper conception of God and of all spiritual beings. God is not a mere idea in the mind. He has a being independent of all conception outside of himself. While he is not matter, and while matter, which constitutes the gross materials of this world, is not God, and while he is not a material God, but a Spirit, yet there is an essence, or substance, which belongs to God, and of itself, and in its kind, is just as real and as tangible as the substance of material things.

To confound God and the universe, contending that God exists in all material things, and that stars and clouds, rocks and sands, plants and beasts, are parts of God, is most irrational and absurd. To represent, as some have done, that the divine nature is a certain force, or energy, diffused throughout the whole universe, and acts in every part of the great structure, falls very far short of the truth, and is nothing more than a Utopian dream. It is true that God is everywhere present, and acts; governs, and executes his will, in every place; but he is not diffused into nature, nor imparted in his essence to any creature, or any thing. The divine nature is unlike any and every other nature, and the divine essence is distinct from the essence of the universe, and the Divine Being is separate from and independent of every other being. God is subject to none of the mutations incident to materiality. He cannot be increased or diminished, expanded or contracted, divided or diffused. The pantheistic theory is equally destitute of authority from Scripture and philosophy. It is difficult to decide which scheme is farthest removed from the dictates of common reason—the pantheistic theory, which confounds God with the universe, or the mythical theory, which makes God only an idea.

God, in his personal entity, is constituted of essence; and he is not the universe, nor space, nor any part of either. His essence is neither infusible nor diffusible. The universe is not in any way constituted of his essence. He has neither human nor angelic form, but he has form of his own. In his substance, "God is a Spirit." To the support of this position sufficient testimony can be adduced. The Bible is replete with teaching to this effect. Jesus asserted: "God is a Spirit; and they that worship him must worship him in spirit and in truth." God is neither dead nor inert, but he is a living being, having life in himself, and acting of himself. Jeremiah, the inspired prophet, says: "But the Lord is the true God; he is the living God." Paul, the inspired apostle, in many places of his writings, calls him "the living God." David, the psalmist, cries out for "the living God." As a living God he is the source of all vitality, and the author of all being. He is the Maker of all things.

Both Manicheism and Polytheism are alike unphilosophical and unscriptural. The doctrine of gods many and of lords many cannot be admitted into the creed of a philosopher, or of a Christian. God is not present in one place as light and in another place as darkness, nor does he preside over light while another deity presides over darkness. God is absolute and perfect, and cannot divide his dominion with another. God is one and indivisible, pure and uncompounded, absolute and alone—the same yesterday, to-day, and forever. No learning, however beautified and ornamented by the gilded splendors of rhetoric, and no genius, however powerful and sublime, can give any credibility to the fiction of many and different deities. No doctrine is more fallacious and dangerous than the doctrine of Polytheism. It is the doctrine most conducive to idolatry, and wherever it prevails ridiculous superstitions, extravagance, madness, and lewdness find favor. The law of Moses con-

tains a declaration asserting that there is but one God, and also contains a protest against a recognition of any other: "Unto thee it was shewed, that thou mightest know that the Lord he is God; there is none else beside him." "Hear, O Israel: The Lord our God is one Lord; and thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thine heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy might." The utterance of the prophet Isaiah is equally emphatic in setting forth the oneness of God, and in protesting against any claim or recognition of any other: "I am the Lord: that is my name; and my glory will I not give to another, neither my praise to graven images." These are portions of the inspired writings which, as distinct utterances, set forth the oneness of God. Many similar declarations, in more or less clearly defined terms, might be given from the Scriptures, confirming and establishing the doctrine that "there is but one living and true God."

The existing universe and the administration thereof demonstrate that there is only one God; there is unity and uniformity in these. The universe is not made up of separate and isolated worlds, bearing no relation to each other, but it is a unit, every portion being but a part of the whole. There is in the universe great variety—nevertheless, it is not the variety which finds existence in straggling and antagonistic atoms, but it is the variety which finds its beauty and utility in harmony and unity. The world throughout is a system, showing that it was designed by one mind, produced by one hand, and is under the jurisdiction of one Ruler.

God is eternal, immutable, ubiquitous, omnipotent, and omniscient. He is holy and just, good and true.

God is "the high and lofty One that inhabiteth eternity." He is "the everlasting God." Without beginning of days or end of time, he always was and always will be; he is "the Alpha and the Omega," "the beginning and the end,"

“the first and the last.” “Before the mountains were brought forth, or ever thou hadst formed the earth and the world, even from everlasting to everlasting, thou art God.” “Thy throne is established of old; thou art from everlasting.” “Thy years are throughout all generations. Of old hast thou laid the foundation of the earth; and the heavens are the work of thy hands. They shall perish, but thou shalt endure; yea, all of them shall wax old like a garment, and as a vesture shalt thou change them, and they shall be changed; but thou art the same, and thy years shall have no end.” To be, and yet with no beginning, and to be, and yet with no ending—all of which the human mind, when instructed, can conceive and understand—is what is meant by eternal existence; and this pertains to God. Succession makes no impression on an ever-enduring substance. Succession, as relates to the lapse of time, neither subtracts from nor adds to an ever-enduring essence. God’s eternal duration is independent and absolute. His eternal duration has no dependence upon time, and no relation thereto, except that he existed before time began, and he will exist after time is no more, and his existence continued while time went on. Long after the mode and computation of time have ceased, God, with his inherent perfections, will still exist, the immortal and ever-living God.

The Almighty is as immutable as he is enduring. Amid the mutations of time and things Jehovah abides “the same yesterday, to-day, and forever.” St. James, writing to and greeting the twelve tribes which were scattered abroad, and admonishing his brethren against errors, asserts: “Every good gift and every perfect gift is from above, and cometh down from the Father of lights, with whom is no variable-ness, neither shadow of turning.” The great “I AM” asserts of himself: “I am the Lord: I change not; therefore ye sons of Jacob are not consumed.” God in his essence

is unchangeable, and in his perfections is immutable. He cannot lose his perfections, he cannot ignore any of his attributes. In his word, oath, and law he can never change. When he commands it stands fast. He never changes his law. It is the same throughout eternity. He never changes in his relation to and his estimate of sin and righteousness. He always condemns the one and approves the other. He is without any variation, holy, good, and true. But it must not be forgotten that in his administration God does change, and so changes that he does the things which he said he would not do, and fails to do the things which he said he would do. The prayers of his creatures change his administration. Many things have been done in answer to prayer which would not have been had no prayer been offered. Prayer avails to change God, and to so change him as to turn away his curse and bring his blessing. St. James sets this forth in a recital of the case of Elias: "The effectual, fervent prayer of a righteous man availeth much. Elias was a man subject to like passions as we are, and he prayed earnestly that it might not rain; and it rained not on the earth by the space of three years and six months. And he prayed again, and the heaven gave rain, and the earth brought forth her fruit." Another case to which reference may be made is the case of Nineveh. The Lord sent Jonah to that place to preach unto it the doctrines which he should bid him. And Jonah proclaimed the word of the Lord and said: "Yet forty days, and Nineveh shall be overthrown." That was positive and emphatic. "The people of Nineveh believed God," as his word had been declared to them by Jonah, and they proclaimed a fast, and put on sackcloth, and turned away from their evil way, and cried mightily unto God. "And God saw their works, that they turned from their evil way; and God repented of the evil that he said that he would do unto them; and he did

it not." Another case in point, and one of great force and beauty, is the case of Hezekiah: "In those days was Hezekiah sick unto death. And the prophet Isaiah the son of Amoz came to him, and said unto him, Thus saith the Lord, Set thine house in order; for thou shalt die, and not live. Then he turned his face to the wall, and prayed unto the Lord, saying, I beseech thee, O Lord, remember now how I have walked before thee in truth and with a perfect heart, and have done that which is good in thy sight. And Hezekiah wept sore. And it came to pass, afore Isaiah was gone out into the middle court, that the word of the Lord came to him, saying, Turn again, and tell Hezekiah the captain of my people, Thus saith the Lord, the God of David thy father, I have heard thy prayer, I have seen thy tears; behold, I will heal thee; on the third day thou shalt go up unto the house of the Lord. And I will add unto thy days fifteen years."

Here are two cases where the Lord said he would do and did not; where he repented and turned away from his own purpose and from his wrath. No objection can be urged against the word "change" as applied to the Lord so long as it is written: "Thou shalt die, and not live;" "Behold, I will heal thee;" "And God repented of the evil that he had said that he would do unto them, and he did it not." Nothing is gained either by saying that the individuals and peoples concerned changed. This does not affect the case at all.

The ubiquity of God is taught in the Scriptures, and this doctrine is consonant to reason and nature. God is everywhere. He is present everywhere at one and the same time, and always. Solomon reverently addresses the Almighty in these words: "Behold, heaven and the heaven of heavens cannot contain thee." David, in sublime strains, magnifies the omniscient God, and in most beautiful and

magnificent terms sets forth his omnipresence: "Whither shall I go from thy Spirit? or whither shall I flee from thy presence? If I ascend up into heaven, thou art there; if I make my bed in hell, behold, thou art there. If I take the wings of the morning, and dwell in the uttermost parts of the sea, even there shall thy hand lead me, and thy right-hand shall hold me. If I say, Surely the darkness shall cover me; even the night shall be light about me. Yea, the darkness hideth not from thee; but the night shineth as the day; the darkness and the light are alike to thee." Interrogatively God delivers to Jeremiah a description of himself: "Am I a God at hand, saith the Lord, and not a God afar off? Can any hide himself in secret places that I shall not see him? saith the Lord. Do not I fill heaven and earth? saith the Lord." In his knowledge, oversight, and administration, God is everywhere present, filling immensity; and, in this way, he is alike present everywhere; but in his personal entity he is in heaven as he is not in hell, and as he is not in any other place. This is a vital truth which should always be recognized. Verily, God must not be materialized nor localized, for he himself saith, "Do not I fill heaven and earth?" And the apostle teaches that "we ought not to think that the Godhead is like unto gold, or silver, or stone, graven by art and man's device." But God is in heaven as he is nowhere else; and in heaven he is seen, comprehended, and communed with as he is not seen, comprehended, and communed with in any other place. Jesus represents himself as having come, when he took human nature, down from heaven: "And no man hath ascended up to heaven but he that came down from heaven, even the Son of man which is in heaven;" "For I came down from heaven;" "The second man is the Lord from heaven." We are taught to pray to "our Father which is in heaven." Jesus Christ "ascended into heaven, and sit-

teth on the right-hand of God the Father Almighty." A man is present wherever he sees, hears, and knows what is going on, and participates therein; and as God sees every thing that is to be seen in every place, and hears every thing that is to be heard in every place, and knows every thing that is to be known in every place, and participates in every occurrence in the range of space, he is everywhere, though his essence and personal entity are not diffused through all space; and this while it may be true, as has been said, that "his center is everywhere and his circumference is nowhere." He is Lord over all things. He is an omnipresent God:

God "appeared unto Abraham, unto Isaac, and Jacob by the name of God Almighty." "Power belongeth unto God." This scripture contains something more than a solemn utterance, and the declaration here made is meant as something more than an empty compliment to the perfections of the Most High. However the mind may revel in the contemplation of sublime sentiments, and however ennobling this may be, there is something more than the pleasures of sentiment in the doctrine of divine power. By "omnipotence" is meant the power, or strength, or capacity to do all things. To God belongs power. He possesses, though he may not exercise it, all power in heaven and on earth. He possesses power preëminently and transcendently. Dominion and power, though both belong to God, are not one and the same. Comprehension is not the same as power, however it may be connected therewith and essential thereto. Authority must not be confounded with power, however it may spring therefrom. Pearson, an author usually clear and logical, has suffered himself to be confused in these points, as he has treated them in his "Exposition of the Creed." God has strength to do whatever comes within the purview of the divine will or purpose.

The exercise of his omnipotence does not exhaust God in any degree. His power is not only irresistible, it is absolute; it not only exceeds the power of all other beings, it is perfect. God can do whatever he wills, and he can will whatever is agreeable to or consistent with his own perfections. He cannot work contradictions nor perform inconsistencies. He cannot make a thing to be and not to be at the same time. He cannot make darkness light, nor light darkness. He cannot make wrong right, nor right wrong. But it no more limits his power that he cannot work a contradiction than it limits his veracity that he cannot tell a lie.

Knowledge is a certain and correct perception of whatever is a subject of perception, whether of things actually existing or of things which may hereafter exist. Omniscience encompasses the actual and the possible. The by-gone, the present, and the coming events and things are equally and alike encompassed thereby. God is omnipresent and omniscient. However it may be necessary to enlarge upon the subject, all can be said in two sentences, or three at most. God knows at once all that is to be known. He knows that which is and that which is to be, or that which will be. His perception and knowledge are infinite. He does not acquire knowledge—it belongs to him, is inherent in him. “Shall any teach God knowledge?” “For the Lord is a God of knowledge.” “Who hath directed the Spirit of the Lord, or being his counselor hath taught him? With whom took he counsel, or who instructed him, and taught him in the path of judgment, and taught him knowledge, and showed to him the way of understanding?” “He that teacheth man knowledge shall not he know? The Lord knoweth the thoughts of man, that they are vanity.”

God's knowledge reaches unto all things. Has God a knowledge of events previous to their occurrence, and of

things previous to their existence? Has he a previous knowledge of contingent events? God's *prescience* is as clearly taught and as conclusively demonstrated, by the Scriptures and by the divine administration, as is his omniscience. "Known unto God are all his works from the beginning of the world." It has been said by some divines that it is impossible for God to know any thing about contingent events in advance of their occurrence; that the prescience of an event would destroy its contingency, and that the prescience of an act would destroy the freedom of the one who performs the act. These are mere assumptions, difficulties only in imagination. Prescience has no more to do in causing or preventing an event, or in forcing or restraining the will of a moral agent, than do the tides of the ocean. There can be no doubt that God has foreknown and foretold, many years in advance, very many events which subsequently occurred—events too which, previous to their occurrence, were as contingent as ever were any events. God has foreknown and foretold many deeds which were subsequently performed by free, unrestrained, and responsible agents. The Bible gives account of many such events and many such deeds. There can therefore be no real contradiction and no real difficulty in the case. It must be admitted that events and acts can be foreknown and foretold, with exactness and in detail, and at the same time be contingent and free—contingent and free in all that pertains to contingency and freedom in occurrences and performances; or it must be admitted, on the other hand, that many of the most important events in the history of nations have not been contingent, and that many of the most important actions of men have not been the actions of free agents. The admission that many important events have not been contingent, and many important actions of men have not been the actions of free agents, will hardly be made by any con-

sistent Arminian or by any sound theologian: All the acts of a moral agent are acts freely committed, and all events dependent upon the acts of moral agents are contingent. The acts are freely committed in that the agents are free to commit them or not as they choose. The events are contingent in that they may or may not be as they are. The two things "prescience" and "contingency" coëxist; the two things "prescience" and "liberty of action" coëxist. This is true, the insurmountable objections conjured up by theologians to the contrary notwithstanding.

Before closing what is to be said on the "omniscience of God," it is preëminently proper to present and investigate some cases in which the divine prescience, contingency of event, and human freedom conjoin. The betrayal of Jesus Christ by Judas Iscariot is a case suitable to the purpose in hand. About a thousand years before Jesus was born, David, inspired by the Holy Ghost, uttered the following sentences: "Yea, mine own familiar friend, in whom I trusted, which did eat of my bread, hath lifted up his heel against me;" "Let his days be few, and let another take his office." This is a specific prophecy, giving a specific account of the betrayal of Christ by Judas. That this is so Jesus and Peter have both testified. Jesus, when setting forth the treachery of Judas, said: "I speak not of you all: I know whom I have chosen; but that the Scripture may be fulfilled, He that eateth bread with me hath lifted up his heel against me." Peter, as reported in the Acts of the Apostles, says: "Men and brethren, this Scripture must needs have been fulfilled, which the Holy Ghost, by the mouth of David, spake before concerning Judas, which was guide to them that took Jesus. . . . For it is written in the book of Psalms, Let his habitation be desolate, and let no man dwell therein; and his bishopric let another take." Here is inspired and divine application of these prophecies

to the betrayal of Jesus by Judas. The life and entire career of Judas is foretold in minutest detail. These prophecies set forth every thing about him—his intimacy with Christ, his apostleship, his hypocrisy, his treachery, his confession, his remorse, his presentation of the bribe to those from whom he received it, his despair, his infamy, and the vacation and filling of his apostolic office. His case fulfills every item.

This transaction of Judas was foreknown and foretold; was recorded as prophecy away back in prophetic times, and yet Judas did the thing most freely and voluntarily. He acted without any extraneous force, compulsion, or necessity. So unrestrained and free was Judas that he was responsible for his action in the premises, and by the same brought guilt and woe upon himself. "He that dippeth his hand with me in the dish, the same shall betray me. The Son of man goeth as it is written of him; but woe unto that man by whom the Son of man is betrayed! It had been good for that man had he not been born." This is Christ's estimate of this man's act, and his authoritative announcement of the measure of his guilt and the eternal penalty attached thereto.

That divine prescience, contingency of event, and human freedom can and do coëxist can no more be denied than can be denied the divinity and miracles of Jesus Christ. A foreknown event is no more a necessary event than it would be were it unknown. Antecedent knowledge no more necessitates and no more influences and forces an action than posterior knowledge.

Another case to which reference may be made in this connection is that of Peter in the denial of his Lord in the hour of his arrest. Jesus told Peter several hours in advance of the transaction, in perspicuous language, and in an earnest and sorrowful tone, what he (Peter) would do and the par-

particulars attending the act. "Jesus said unto him, Verily I say unto thee, That this night, before the cock crow, thou shalt deny me thrice." Peter was so far from believing that he would do this—it was so abhorrent to his feelings, it was so incongruous with his faith and courage, it was so antagonistic to every element of his character—that, though Christ asserted to him that he would commit this deed, he emphatically, most vehemently, yet lovingly, repelled the announcement. "Peter said unto him, Though I should die with thee, yet will I not deny thee."

Here was a transaction foretold with minutest particularity by the Son of God. Here was prescience, here was positive foreknowledge of futurity; and yet Peter was positively free in the whole transaction. Peter knew that he acted freely, and without any restraint or necessity which destroyed his responsibility in the case, without any restraint or necessity whatever, and, consequently, that he was verily guilty of a grievous sin; "and he went out and wept bitterly" when he reflected on the deed. He wept on account of this deed, and repented of it, which he could not have done had he been forced to the act. This case, as it stands in the record, is free from all subtlety, and no ingenious argument, nor fanciful speculation, nor even abstruse reasoning, can serve to disguise the plain truth herein contained. This case cannot be made to serve the exigences, nor to support the pernicious fancies of those who attempt to demolish the sublime doctrine of the divine prescience.

If it is desirable to keep up a conscientious regard for divine revelation, and a rational veneration of divine worship; if it is desirable to deepen the piety, and inflame the zeal, and intensify the integrity of Christians, then it is important to give unreserved credence to the doctrine of the divine prescience, and maintain this doctrine uncorrupted.

God is holy. It has been said—and the profoundest im-

portance has been attached to this—that holiness is right action, and that there can be no holiness prior to and without an act. Various terms have been used in asserting this theory: such as that the true nature of holiness is found in acts of the will, and in practical habits of the will; that holiness consists in personal acting and doing; that all moral goodness consists in acts of the will, and in the habits formed by the repetition of such acts; that righteousness is right action; that holiness consists not in the right state of the powers with which the being is endowed, but in the right exercise of those powers. Those holding this theory and using these definitions have said “that the highest excellency of God himself is right action.” Upon the basis of this theory it is asserted that God himself could not be holy until he acted, until he performed right actions. It is also asserted in this connection that God could not create a holy being, and that the doctrine which teaches that righteousness, or holiness, was concreated with Adam, or wrought into his nature, is without foundation, and involves absurdities and contradictions. The basis and the culmination of all this are in the definition, “Holiness is right action.” Dr. John Taylor, of Norwich, England, and Dr. Albert T. Bledsoe, of America, and all other Arians and Pelagians, hold and defend these points and definitions herein given. Graver errors and greater fallacies could scarcely be found in all the range of heresy. These are parts of a system which antagonizes every vital doctrine of Christianity, and falsifies the character and nature of God himself.

That is a most grievous error which makes holiness synonymous with choice and synonymous with obedience, and which makes love and obedience the same. Love and obedience are not the same. Obedience is the result, or fruit, of love, and the evidence of its existence. Holiness is not synonymous with choice, and is not synonymous with obe-

dience. Obedience is one thing, and holiness is another. A being may be holy before he has willed or acted. The choice of holiness comes of holy principles, and holy acts come of holy principles, and may be an evidence of their existence. That is equally fallacious which asserts that holiness cannot be concreated with a moral creature. A necessitated volition is impossible, and such a thing involves a contradiction, but a concreated holiness and a virtuous nature are possible, and are realities. A being is holy if he is holy, and a being may be declared holy on account of moral goodness inherent in him, and admired and approved for it, even though it was concreated with him. Praise and approval are not virtue, but virtue merits approval, however attained, or from whatever source derived.

Holiness is immaculateness. Holiness is a quality, a state, and not an act. Holiness is a moral quality belonging to moral beings, just as hardness is a quality belonging to material bodies. Primarily holiness is in no way dependent on choice, action, or habit. Holiness is native to all moral beings in their pristine state, and is precedent to all action. Holiness is not an act, though actions may promote or destroy holiness according as these actions are holy or vicious. Actions may be holy; and they are holy or vicious as they conform to or antagonize the divine law given as a rule for moral conduct. It is also true that holiness is a quality which is attainable, in the case of fallen man, under the dispensations of grace; but, however holiness has been attained, whether by the original constitution with which the being was endowed, or by the provisions and dispensations of grace, it is a quality and a state, and not an act, whenever and wherever existing. Justice and truth are no more elements of holiness than they are elements of goodness and mercy, and they no more constitute holiness than they constitute goodness and mercy.

How is God related to holiness? Holiness is a quality of his very being. Holiness is an absolute quality in God. It pertains to him as absolutely as does his essence, or being, and is as much underived as is his essence, or being. Holiness is predicated of the Almighty. He himself claims to be holy, and his inspired prophets ascribe holiness to him.

The Lord said to Moses: "Speak unto all the congregation of the children of Israel, and say unto them, Ye shall be holy, for I, the Lord your God, am holy." To Isaiah he said: "For I am the Lord thy God, the Holy One of Israel, thy Saviour." Habakkuk, with the theme of inspiration on his lips, said of the Lord: "Thou art of purer eyes than to behold evil, and canst not look on iniquity." As Moses and the children of Israel sung their song of triumph, they said unto God: "Who is like unto thee, O Lord, among the gods? who is like thee glorious in holiness, fearful in praises, doing wonders?" The psalmist, in the majesty of his strains, sings: "Exalt the Lord our God, and worship at his holy hill; for the Lord our God is holy." The climax in the ascription of praise is reached in the ceaseless song: "Holy, holy, holy, Lord God Almighty, which was, and is, and is to come."

Justice is inherent in God. "Great and marvelous are thy works, Lord God Almighty; just and true are thy ways, thou King of saints." This is an encomium, but it is a description of and an encomium upon the works of God, rather than of God himself. God is just in all his doings, and true in all his dispensations, but prior to and independent of all this, justice is a quality of his own being. Moses sets this forth in his inimitable song, in which he exclaims: "A God of truth, and without iniquity, just and right is he!" God is so compact, complete, straight, exact, as to be the embodiment, model, and standard of equity and justice. The idea, law, and rule of justice originate in and emanate

from God. Scales balanced in the hands of some blind goddess are a feeble presentation and a sorry representation of justice. God with his perfections compacting the completeness of his own being embodies the idea and the quality called justice. Whatever may be the exercise or manifestation of justice in the dealings of men one with another, and in the administration of law in the government of peoples, all finds its beauty and completeness in God.

Justice, as it is inherent in God, is that in which all ranks and orders of moral beings have embodied for them exact rectitude. Justice, as it is inherent in God, is that quality and law by which all actions, throughout the domain of moral existence, are to be regulated. This embodiment of justice sums all that can be estimated in the conceptions of moral excellence. Addition and diminution are foreign to justice. It is exact, square, straight, without deviation or variation. The miscreant given to sensuality and debauchery, to avarice and rapacity, to oppression and violence, and to feuds and frauds, perverting his own functions, and losing himself in his own fluctuations and obloquy, knows nothing of the beauty of justice, and nothing of the tranquillity and happiness which exist where justice reigns; to the bliss of felt gratitude, and to the sweets of living joy, and of inspiring hope, he is an entire stranger; beatific visions never greet his gaze; no swelling tide of rapture wafts him to brighter scenes, and to better days. He whose character and conduct quadrate with justice has a quality and a virtue which make him so far forth akin to God.

Justice and sin are antagonistic, and irreconcilable. In the very nature of the case conflict ensues upon the entrance of sin, and the contest is eternal. Justice is as much concerned in suppressing and punishing sin as it is in maintaining its own existence, and is as pertinacious in the one case as in the other. Justice, with its inalienable preroga-

tives, can no more cease its controversy with sin, and can no more withhold its strokes of punishment upon sin, than it can become its own antagonist, or than it can terminate its own existence. Justice is vested with immortality and supremacy. Sin is repugnant and execrable. To connive at sin, and to fail to anathematize it, is to fail to vindicate justice.

The goodness of God is so clearly manifest, and so extensively recognized, that he has been called "The Good One." It is not, however, true that "god" and "good" are words of the same import. These words are not synonymous. The word "good" is applied to the Divine Being as expressive of one of his qualities, or designative of one of his attributes. The word "god" is applied to him as his name, and designative of his being and nature in the entireness thereof, as the Supreme Being, holding dominion over all things. Goodness is a moral quality as it is ascribed to God, and is descriptive of a benevolent nature, a virtue that moves in conferring benefit and happiness.

In the realm of being there is nothing more admirable than that moral quality called goodness. Against this quality there is no law; it is subject to no condemnation, though perverted views are entertained as to what it is, and with what it is consistent. Selfishness itself is approved and defended by those who would, nevertheless, abstractly commend benevolence. Benevolence and sin collide, and with these there can be no alliance. Benevolence protests against sin, and ever condemns it. Goodness is not an indiscriminating something, blind to the distinctions of right and wrong; and while it exists happiness can never accrue to moral delinquency. God is good. He is essentially benevolent. It is said, by some, that if God is a benevolent being, and a wise and omnipotent sovereign, he should not, and could not, permit a state of things productive of dis-

content and misery. Those holding this view conclude that as there is misery God is not good. But the existence of sin and suffering no more justifies the inference that God is not good than it justifies the inference that he is not omnipotent; no more justifies the inference that he is not good than it justifies the inference that he does not exist. It is useless to urge captious and groundless objections to the character of God. He is not a selfish and malignant being. He gives no sanctions to vice, and renders no assistance to agencies which are productive only of misery. God, in his goodness, cannot approve of the detestable passions which rankle in the natures of moral delinquents, or the dissolute habits in which they indulge. Hence, he punishes sin. Sin and misery are inseparable, and so are pain and punishment. Suffering is inflicted as a retribution. Neither astuteness nor acuteness can refute this truth. Adversity and afflictions may be administered as correctives, and, under corrective dispensations, may lead to reformation, and may nourish virtue, but the demand for reformation and the production of virtue is found in the existence of sin, and so are these afflictions and sufferings. It is true that justice can demand nothing that is inconsistent with goodness, but sin is inconsistent with goodness as well as with justice, and must be condemned by goodness no less than by justice.

Reconciling the goodness of God with existing misery pushes back to another question—namely, the origin and existence of sin. How can God be God, and sin exist? This is the question to be answered. When this is properly answered, the question of reconciling existing misery with the divine goodness will disappear. God can be God, and at the same time sin exist. This is true; otherwise it must be denied either that God exists or that there is sin. If God exists at all, he is omnipotent, wise, and good. How does sin exist in the dominions of a wise, benevolent,

and omnipotent Sovereign? Sin impinges God's being and law, and consequently, can never be essential to him nor any of his purposes. No profit can ever accrue to God, or to others, through, by, or from sin. No good can ever, in any form, come of sin. God may, in the midst of moral waste and wreck, build up good, but the good would have been complete without the waste and wreck. The waste and wreck are not necessary to the completion or manifestation of any thing divine.

In formulating a creed on the origin and existence of sin, a field of boundless dimensions has been explored; in the meantime, a variety of theories on the subject have been invented. Many minds have imperfectly apprehended the subject, as can be seen by the fallacious arguments they have adduced, and the uncertain speculations which they have indulged. The researches made demonstrate that it is useless to range the fields of science and philosophy for an adequate understanding of the subject and a satisfactory solution of the questions pertaining thereto. The whole solution must be made within certain limits. The question, Whence did sin originate? can be answered only by an appeal to the Scriptures. The disputations of sages and philosophers are worth nothing in settling this question. A satisfactory dogma and a settled faith may be secured by adhering to the divine record. Philosophy must yield to the Bible, and superstition must yield to faith.

All other theories being irreconcilable with each other, and false in themselves, are refuted by the establishment of the following theory—the theory taught in the Scriptures, namely, that by the old serpent called the devil, and Satan, and by the first man, Adam, sin entered into the world. These, the devil and Adam—moral agents that they were, in the exercise of their own natural endowments—transgressed God's law, and thus sin entered into the world, and

woc followed. God could make moral agents, and he did. As he made these they were capable of doing whatsoever they might choose. Moral agency is the highest endowment of the noblest and most exalted beings which God has made, and is conducive to the very best ends of the divine benevolence, though its existence involved, under certain conditions, the liability to sin, and eventuated therein. In making and putting moral beings under law, God did not ordain the existence of sin nor give his sanction to its perpetration. He, in advance, forbade it, and warned against its liabilities and dangers, and was prompt in condemning it, and punishing for it, when it entered. Here distinctions and subtleties serve rather to confuse than adorn the subject, and they serve to strip God of those excellences inherently belonging to him. Sin has never conduced to the happiness of a single being, and has never added any thing to the manifestations of God's perfections or glory.

The introduction of sin and suffering is accounted for on the basis of moral agency. No theory of fatalism, nor theory of antagonistic decrees on the part of God, nor theory of weakness in the world of matter, nor theory of an original evil being, can give the proper solution of the subject. God did not allow or permit sin to exist *de jure*. When it entered he recognized it *de facto*. Sin exists beyond all question. But, to repeat what has already been said, God never sanctioned sin. He never gave any license to the perpetration of an evil act. He never authorized the transgression of his own law. He permitted moral agents, which he made, to be moral agents. A lawful provision to violate law is a contradiction and an absurdity. God never legislates against himself, and never makes a law antagonistic to his will. And as God never sanctioned or approved sin, so he never made the world to suffer and be miserable. He provided in the origin of his works, for life, immortality,

and happiness; and when sin entered his dominions, he, still pursuing the purpose for life, immortality, and happiness, brought in a dispensation of grace—not a license to sin, but a method of rescue from sin. A righteous ruler may provide for the suppression of a rebellion in his dominions, and for relieving his government of the evils existing therefrom; and he may do this without in any way approving of the rebellion, and without in any way finding pleasure in the misery ensuing; but no ruler can inaugurate a rebellion against the government he administers and perpetuates, nor provide such as a part of his administration. A good ruler, in all benevolence, may inflict judgment and punishment in the suppression of sin in his dominions, and for the punishment of the guilty therein.

Sin and misery are everywhere. At best, the present estate of man is a mixture of good and evil, of pleasure and pain. If there are salubrious climates and fertile soils, giving delight and producing plenty, there are also dry sands and barren wastes, where desolation reigns. If there are spiey, invigorating breezes, and sweet fountains, there are also simooms, suffocating winds, bitter springs, and destructive eyelones. If there is, here and there, a moral oasis, there are also moral wastes as wide as continents. Sin is the transgression of the law of God, and this transgression originated with moral and responsible creatures—creatures placed under law and made amenable thereto; and through sin, thus originating, came death and all suffering. Sin brought in penalty. This is the sum of the whole matter, and here the revelation concentrates and terminates.

“I am the Lord, and there is none else. I form the light and create darkness; I make peace and create evil; I, the Lord, do all these things.” (Isa. xlv. 6, 7.) This passage from the Scriptures has been relied on by many to prove

that God is the author of sin. Selecting this text from the Bible as the basis of one of his sermons, Dr. Henry W. Bellows, of New York, proceeds to say: "The prophets and apostles were much bolder in their assertions than their degenerate followers dare to be. The evil that is in the world they ascribe, without hesitation, not to the perversion which the divine order has received from man, but to the position and direct creation of God, whom they represent, in the text, as saying, 'I make peace and create evil.' . . . I know no indignity that can be put upon God greater than the supposition that the first human creature he made had power to thwart and defy his omnipotence, to change the whole plan and history, and to introduce into the world and the universe an element not desired, nor expected, nor controllable by him, called *sin*; the frightful cause of his eternal displeasure toward millions of his unborn creatures. *Sin* is, by the foreknowledge and permission—in plainer language, by the will—of God, a characteristic element in the schooling of human nature." ("Restatements of Christian Doctrine," pp. 241, 247, 248.)

This interpretation of the above text, if interpretation it can be called, is given by Dr. Bellows in support of a theory, and is consonant to the theory which rejects the inspiration of the Scriptures, the doctrine of the Trinity, and every other evangelical doctrine set forth in the Bible and in orthodox creeds. Dr. Bellows, Unitarian that he is, is not even a degenerate follower of the prophets and apostles, though he is sufficiently bold and rash in asserting that God is the author or creator of sin. The prophets and apostles were not rash men, who uttered bold and rash words suited only to a bold and rash age. They were inspired men, who spoke in God's name and by God's authority. They used sound speech, which cannot be condemned—true words, suited to all times. It is a bold and rash act to assume to

speak now with the authority of inspired prophets and apostles, and it is equally bold to attribute to them that which they never said. Verily, reason "refuses her assent" to the assertion that God, a good and holy being, created sin. The prophets and apostles never said this, nor any thing akin to it. God is the Sovereign of all things, and holds his throne, and asserts his sovereignty, and administers law in all his dominions. God has not withdrawn his presence from any place, nor resigned his dominion anywhere. One God, he is in all places, and he is everywhere the same. He makes and rules the light and the darkness, and his dominion extends alike to all things and to all places. He asserts his authority and enforces his law, even when rebels against his government hold carnival. Here, in the text under consideration, peace and evil are put in antithesis, just as light and darkness are put in antithesis. It is not said that God creates sin, but it is said that he creates evil. He creates evil for the punishment of sin. God maintains his jurisdiction, and in judicial visitation he instigates wars, sends plague and pestilence, fire and famine. He visits these and other evils upon the wicked inhabitants of the earth as punishments for sin and as demonstrations of his wrath upon sinners. He does not institute sin, but punishes it. This is the thought expressed by the Almighty when he says, "I create evil." Majesty and power, grandeur and glory, are ascribed to God, the exhibition of which might produce in his creatures dismay; and with equal fullness goodness is ascribed to him by the inspired revelation: "The Lord is good."

A thousand oracles attest that the infinite "God is true," and that immutable as he is it is impossible for him to lie. As there is no confusion in God, and as in him there is no deviation from rectitude, he must be essential truth itself. "His truth endureth to all generations." "He is the

Rock, his work is perfect; for all his ways are judgment; a God of truth and without iniquity, just and right is he." (Deut. xxxii. 4.)

Many books on theology and other subjects declare mercy to be one of the attributes of God, calling it "the darling attribute" and "a distinguishing attribute of the Supreme Being." Mercy is not an inherent and essential element of being, or of character, and is not an attribute of God. It is an emanation from the attributes of a self-acting being, and is called forth by adventitious circumstances. It springs from the benevolence and love of God; and its rise and exhibition depend on the existence of sin, as there can be no demand or occasion for mercy when and where there is no sin. Sin is prior to mercy. Mercy is a mere exercise, and is simply an exhibition of God's character called forth by sinful condition or state on the part of his creatures, just as grace is called forth by sinful conditions. Mercy is simply an exercise of clemency toward an offender. It would be as correct to say that grace and wrath are attributes of the Almighty as to say that mercy is. In the meantime God is merciful and gracious, and his mercy will not be found lacking so long as there is a sinner in condition and under provision to need mercy and be benefited thereby.

Creeds now extant assign to God invisibility and incomprehensibility, but nothing is thereby added to his excellences or perfections. God is not invisible nor incomprehensible absolutely in and of himself. He is invisible and incomprehensible to finite capacities. He is invisible to finite eyes because finite eyes cannot, in the limit of their own imperfections, penetrate the intervenings between them and God. He is incomprehensible to finite minds because finite minds are incapable, from their own weakness, of comprehending him. When a man extols God as invisible

and unsearchable, he declares God's greatness and speaks his praise, and he declares the imperfections of his own powers as well.

God is a triune being. This is the doctrine of the Bible, and its recognition is essential to a proper Christian theology. An accurate and systematic statement of doctrine is necessary to guard and perpetuate the truth. Nothing must be allowed to lead away from sound theoretical definitions. This doctrine of the Trinity must be adequately and concisely defined; this the profoundness of the subject and the intricacies involved therein imperatively demand. In this triunity, as in other respects, God is unlike every being and every thing. There is nothing with which God can be compared, or to which he can be likened. There is nothing in the universe by which this Trinity can be illustrated. The effort here at illustration is not only futile, it is prolific of error. In the intricate work of setting forth this profound doctrine, the Scriptures alone must be relied on and appealed to, for it is a subject purely of revelation. Whatever revelation teaches concerning the same is to be implicitly believed, and further than the revelation no one can go. To a finite mind the doctrine of the Trinity is mysterious, though it involves no absurdities and no contradictions. The mind, when properly instructed, finds no difficulty in believing that which is mysterious, while no intelligent person can believe a statement which involves a contradiction. These truths must be kept steadily in mind, while the subject now under consideration is further presented.

Triunity teaches that there are three in one. The terms three and one are not the same in meaning, and the numbers three and one are not the same in fact, and these can never be made the same in any sense. If the terms three and one meant the same they would not express the thought

which is intended to be conveyed in their use in this connection. It is because they have a different sense and convey a different meaning that they are brought into use on this profound theme. The Bible nowhere says, and the doctrine of the divine Trinity never attempts to maintain, that three are one, and that one is three. This would be such a glaring contradiction that no invention could conceal it, and no one could afford to defend or tolerate it. St. John says: "There are three that bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost; and these three are one." (1 John v. 7.) St. John here does not say that three are one, and that one is three, but he mentions Father, Word, and Holy Ghost as three, and says these, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost, are one. In this there is no contradiction, and no absurdity. There are not gods many, nor lords many. A plurality of gods is a theory, a mere fancy, born of the superstition which fosters mythology. There cannot be more than one God, but there can be three persons in that one God. There is only one living and true God, "and in unity of this godhead there are three persons, of one substance, power, and eternity—the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost." The Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, are one in unity, one in essence, one in Godhead; the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, are three in person. These, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost—one in unity, and the same in essence, and three in person—constitute in their own being the triune God. The Father is a person, the Son is a person, and the Holy Ghost is a person; these, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, though not separate, are distinct in personality, and so are three persons. The Father is God, the Son is God, the Holy Ghost is God; these, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, are united in the Godhead; these are the same in essence; they exist in indissoluble

oneness, and so they are one God; and thus these three are one.

This God of essential essence and trinity of persons is the one true and living God. The Bible teaches that the Father is a person, that the Son is a person, and that the Holy Ghost is a person. To each of these, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, belongs essence, the constituent substance of being; and each of these, in a simple, primitive, and true sense, is a person. Attributes and offices inhere in persons, but when the Scriptures present and describe the Son of God, and the Holy Ghost, it is not a personification of attributes nor a designation of offices which is presented and described. Jesus Christ, the Son, is as truly God as is the Father, and the Holy Ghost is as truly and essentially God as are the Father and the Son. Great care must be had not to confound the persons nor divide the substance or essence in and of the triune God. The triune God is not a product in any sense. He is not derived in any manner. He has not his being either in essence or person, by emanation, generation, creation, nor procession, but by self-existence. Trinality is of the very nature of God, and is dependent upon no process whatsoever. It is of the nature of God to be trinal, just as it is of his nature to be holy. It would be as well to discuss the method and manner of God's holiness as it would be to discuss the method and manner of his trinity. There is no more manner of the one than there is of the other. There is no more reason for attempting to show how God is a triune God than there is for attempting to show how he is a holy God or an omniscient God. His trinity is just as independent of emanation, generation, creation, and procession, as is his holiness. No theory can be maintained, in harmony with the truth, which has for its basis the idea that Deity has reached by development a state of being

which previously did not pertain thereto. God has ever existed just as he is. He has existed one God from eternity in the three persons of Father, Son, and Holy Ghost.

The relation to each other of the three persons in the Godhead is a subject demanding thorough investigation. The basis has been laid for it in the preceding paragraphs. As a proper perception of God is conducive to the greatest happiness, a perfect knowledge of him is a most desirable attainment. Streams of light flowing in upon the mind from the divine fountain, whose fullness is inexhaustible, fill the soul with joy ineffable and infinite. Many questions have been attached to this subject of the relation of the divine persons to each other in such a way that they cannot be ignored, though in themselves they are not entitled to any consideration. The points involved in this subject have been thrown into such attitudes, by the controversies which have arisen concerning the same, as to greatly complicate them. The theories known as Sabellianism and Arianism have given rise to much of the phraseology used in discussing the origin and relation of the persons in the Godhead. There is no occasion for innovations in the theory long held by the evangelical creed concerning the trinity in unity, but this theory can and must be relieved of the phraseology which has hitherto embarrassed it, as well as some of the opinions connected with that phraseology. In discussing this abstruse and sublime theme precise and unambiguous terms must be sought rather than the display of rhetorical fancies.

Sabellianism, which asserted that there is only one person in the Godhead, that the Son and the Holy Ghost are but different manifestations of the one God the Father, performing different offices of the one God, is most emphatically repudiated here as both unreasonable and unscriptural. Arianism, which asserted that the Son is not divine, but

only a creature, and denied the divinity and personality of the Holy Ghost, is here repudiated as rank and pernicious heresy. The evangelical doctrine that in the Godhead "there are three persons of one substance, power, and eternity—the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost," is here accepted without any reservation, and shall be defended, as has already been done, with the best ability possessed.

How did the Son derive his being? This was the question before the Council of Nice, which was held in the year A.D. 325. The answer to this question depends upon the view taken of the nature of Jesus, the Son. The celebrated council divided into two parties on this question. The party which contended that Jesus, the Son, was not God, insisted that he was created. The party which contended that he was a divine person adopted the position, which they thought an only alternative, that he derived his being by generation. Hence the doctrine of the eternal generation of the Son became the theory of the orthodox party in the Nicene Council. It was orthodox to maintain the divinity of Jesus Christ, the Son, against the position that he was a creature, but it was not necessary to adopt the theory of generation to maintain the truth of his divinity. While it is true that he is the Son, and that he is very God, it is not so clear that he is these by generation. It does not follow that the doctrine of generation is true because the doctrine of creation is false. The orthodox party probably would not have adopted the theory of eternal generation had it not been that, being pressed by their opponents with the argument for creation, they thought as they rejected creation they must present and defend some other method of the Son's origin. Whereas it is unnecessary to account for the manner of the divine existence. The men of that noted council fell into a grave mistake when they attempted to account for the method of the divine relation.

The Son is in no sense derived, neither in his essence nor in his person. He always existed, the Son, the second person in the Trinity—second only in number and relation, not in posteriority. The Son is in no sense from the Father, any more than the Father is from the Son. The divine essence is not derived, and it cannot be compounded nor diminished, divided nor imparted. There is no such thing as emanation in the divine essence. The divine essence is not by generation any more than it is by creation. The existence of the Son is without any thing proceeding from or accruing to the Father. In the essence pertaining to the persons of the Trinity there is no division and no distinction. The divine persons are neither prior nor inferior nor subordinate to each other. There are no grades or degrees distinguishing the persons of the triune God. There is no succession in the personality of the Godhead. The Son is inferior to the Father in nothing pertaining to his divinity; he is inferior to the Father only in the human nature which he took upon himself. The three persons in the Trinity differ only in person and in name, and in what each does in their activities and administrations. The Sonship pertaining to the second person in the Trinity is not communicated. It is under no such imperfection as belongs to communication. Being a Son from eternity, there is no imperfection pertaining thereto. In any and every sense in which Jesus Christ in his divine personality was a Son, he was a Son eternally—that is, from everlasting to everlasting; and in every sense in which the Father in his divine personality was a Father, he was a Father from eternity. The divine essence and the divine persons were neither created nor generated.

Father, Son, and Holy Ghost are terms designating persons in the Trinity and distinguishing them, and further than this are not expressive of paternity nor filiation nor

procession. Son expresses not official title, but personal relation in the Trinity—a divine personal relation. Neither Father; Son, nor Holy Ghost, as terms, expresses any acts by which the relation of the divine persons originated.

The term “begotten,” used in the Scriptures in relation to the second person in the Trinity, is incidental to the name and relation of the Son, and is simply used in declaring and distinguishing him, and is not intended to express action by which the Son receives and has his being, either in essence or person. And this is true whether the term refers to him in his divine existence as he was from eternity, or to him in the union of his two natures as the God-man. “Thou art my Son; this day have I begotten thee.” This no more intends to express action by which he had his essence or being than it intends to declare the beginning of his existence. This simply declares him, announces him, in his being and mission, in his relations, purposes, and achievements.

It has already been stated that in their divine essence and being the persons of the Trinity are neither superior nor inferior to each other. Jesus said: “My Father is greater than I.” This is simply a contrast of the divine nature of the Father with the human nature of Jesus, the Son. The Father, in his divine nature, is greater than Jesus, the Son, in his human nature. At another time, and in another place, Jesus said: “I and my Father are one.” This is simply a portraiture of the divine natures of the Father and the Son. The Father and the Son are one in that they are both divine. Jesus did not intend to assert that the Father had a human nature, and that in this he and the Father were the same, but he intended to assert his own divine nature, and in this the oneness of the two. The Father and the Son are both divine, and in this they are one. The Father is only divine, while the Son is man by

the assumption of human nature; and in this the Father is greater than the Son. Likewise in this the Holy Ghost is greater than the Son. Otherwise the three are equal and one.

An effort has been made to account for and tell how the Holy Ghost, one of the persons in the divine Trinity, originated. This effort has given rise to much controversy, and even to division, in the Church. Some have asserted that the Holy Ghost derived his essence and being from the Father, and others have asserted that he derived his essence and being from the Father and from the Son conjointly. This doctrine is that the Holy Ghost received his essence, being, and nature by procession from the Father and from the Son. Hence some confessions of faith avow the eternal procession of the Holy Ghost from the Father and from the Son.

The divine essence is not communicable, and the Holy Ghost is not the result of a communicated essence from the Father and from the Son. The doctrine of Procession, in the sense of communicating the essence, being, and nature of the Holy Ghost, is without foundation in reason and Scripture. There is no truth in the theory. "Eternal procession" is a phrase contradictory in itself. The Holy Ghost is a divine person—is very God. His essence and being are underived. He exists, is self-existent, and is not from any source whatsoever. The triune God is without origin. He is underived. God existed triune from eternity. There was no source from whence he came, nor process nor action by which he derived his being or received his nature. The Holy Ghost, in the origin and existence of himself, is without creation, procession, or action of any sort. The Holy Ghost, in the origin of his essence, does not proceed from the Son any more than the Son proceeds from the Holy Ghost. The Holy Ghost, in the origin of his essence, does not proceed from the Father any more than the Father proceeds from the

Holy Ghost. The Holy Ghost, in the origin of his essence, does not proceed from the Father nor from the Son any more than the Father proceeds from the Son or the Son proceeds from the Father.

“But when the Comforter is come, whom I will send unto you from the Father, even the Spirit of truth, which proceedeth from the Father, he will testify of me.” This passage of Scripture, found in John xv. 26, has been adduced to prove that the Holy Ghost, in his essence, proceeds from the Father and from the Son. The doctrine of Eternal Procession was not found in and brought out of this text, but the doctrine was invented, and then brought to and reclined on this text for support. This is the best scriptural authority that could be adduced in defense of the dogma, and, insufficient as it is for that purpose, it has been marshaled into service. This text is by no means obscure, and is environed by no great difficulties. The doctrine of the oneness of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost lies deeply imbedded in this text, and the divine harmony of these three is authoritatively announced therein. This, and not the spreading of the Father’s essence, is in the text. The term, in the text, “proceedeth from the Father,” is the term specially relied on to prove this doctrine of Procession. But the coming forth of the Holy Ghost from the Father in heaven, to the disciples of Jesus on the earth, is all that is meant by this term, and is all that can possibly be intended thereby. The simple meaning of the word “proceed” is to move forward from one place, person, or thing to another; to issue out from. Jesus, for instance, when he made his advent as Messiah, “proceeded forth and came from God;” and so of a truth he came down from God the Father out of heaven. In like manner, and in the same sense, and in no other, the Holy Ghost proceeded from the Father. Jesus sent the Holy Ghost from

heaven to his disciples who were upon the earth; the Holy Ghost came, and in this coming to the disciples on the earth he came from, proceeded from, the Father and from the Son. This, and nothing more.

“And because ye are sons God hath sent forth the Spirit of his Son into your hearts, crying, Abba, Father.” This text, found in Galatians iv. 6, has been brought forward to prove that the Holy Ghost, in his essence, proceeds from the Son. The Holy Ghost is called, in this text, the Spirit of the Son; and hence it is claimed that as he is his Spirit he must, in his essence, proceed from the Son. He is not the Spirit of the Son by virtue of the reception of his essence and existence from the Son, but from another consideration altogether. The Holy Ghost is of the Son and with the Son, just as the Father and the Son are of and with the Holy Ghost, and no otherwise. The Holy Ghost is the Spirit of Christ because, according to the promise made to the disciples, he was sent forth into the world by Christ, when Christ ascended up on high, and led captivity captive and gave gifts unto men. He is the Spirit of Christ because he testifies of Christ, or bears witness of his divine work as Mediator and Redeemer.

Here closes the proof which the advocates of the doctrine of Procession adduce from the Scriptures. And it is manifest that this doctrine of Procession is without any authority from Scripture, and must for that reason be rejected. Every phase of doctrine which teaches the production of one of the divine persons by, or from, the others, or which teaches the subordination of one of the persons of the Trinity to the others, must be rejected as inimical to truth. The Holy Ghost has never been produced, or caused; and not having been formed from the divine substance, he cannot be absorbed into the substance of the Deity. He cannot be absorbed into his own substance,

nor absorbed in any way whatsoever. It requires no acute reasoning to demonstrate this truth. The Holy Ghost is an underived being, and his divinity and personality cannot be denied, and cannot be explained away by rhetorical flourishes.

As God is approached for worship it is very important that he be apprehended as a triune God, and that his trinity be recognized as from everlasting. As the triune God he is from none. The Father is from none; the Son is from none; the Holy Ghost is from none. Let all the intelligent creatures in the universe join in the doxology: "To Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, one God in persons three, be everlasting praises given."

In the great scheme of salvation from sin stands centrally and preëminently Jesus Christ, the Son of God, the Son of man, the God-man. Jesus Christ is *sui generis*. Earth, sun, moon, and stars; seeds, plants, and trees; reptiles, beasts, fowls, and fishes; and men and angels, and whatever else is, have their natures; but in all, from the lowest to the highest, there is nothing like Jesus Christ. He unites in himself two whole and perfect natures. He has united in him—not blended and mixed, but united—two natures, wherein and whereof he is both God and man, wherein and whereof he is one person, the God-man.

The Incarnation—the assumption of human nature by the Son of God, the second person in the Trinity—is the most wonderful event in all the occurrences taking place in the cycles of eternity. Here, in the person of Jesus, the Son of God and the Son of Mary, is a being strangely combining superiority and inferiority. He possessed divine power and divine knowledge, and was under the disabilities of human weakness and human ignorance. Paradoxical as it may be, he possessed all things, and yet had nothing. He was the author of all life, had life in

himself, and yet was subject to the power of death. In him is found the mystery of all mysteries. Without doubt there is nothing more mysterious than the union of two natures, the divine and the human, in one person. There is nothing more mysterious than "God manifest in the flesh." This is the mystery to be considered and accepted in Jesus Christ. "Without all controversy, great is the mystery of godliness; God was manifest in the flesh, justified in the Spirit, seen of angels, preached unto the Gentiles, believed on in the world, received up into glory."

The Son of God took not the nature of angels, but man's nature, and dwelt in human flesh. Jesus of Nazareth was born of a woman. He was a man. "For what the law could not do, in that it was weak through the flesh, God sending his own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh and for sin, condemned sin in the flesh." "Every spirit that confesseth that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh is of God; and every spirit that confesseth not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh is not of God." That the Son of God took on him the nature of Abraham, and was of the seed of David, is an essential article of the Christian creed, and as such must be demonstrated and vindicated; for false prophets and avowed infidels have denied that "the Word was made flesh and dwelt among us," for "many deceivers are entered into the world, who confess not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh." Jesus Christ was a man. His human nature has been manifested and demonstrated through sufferings. He has been revealed as a brother—as a brother in the sufferings incident to the life through which every human being must pass. He endured grief and sorrows, burdens and fatigue, hunger and destitution; he endured imprisonments and stripes, tortures and anguish, maledictions and death. Accumulated proof this that he was a man. His was an entire human nature;

he had a rational soul as well as a perfect human body. The Apollinarian scheme—which denies to Christ a rational soul, reduces him to an imperfect being, makes him inferior to ordinary men—presents him with the material elements of human nature without that in which reside the intellectual and moral faculties and qualities. When, on that memorable occasion, he was in the garden, his soul was exceeding sorrowful, even unto death; and when on the cross, he bowed his head and gave up the ghost. He could not give up a spirit of which he was destitute, and sorrow could not oppress a soul of which he was void. The scientific speculations in which this Apollinarian theory was founded were false in themselves, and hence the theory is absurd in all its features.

Jesus Christ was the omnipotent, omniscient, and eternal God. He was before all things, having life and existence in himself, and giving life and being to all things. That he was omnipotent and omniscient is demonstrated by the works which he wrought and the doctrines which he taught. He controlled, as omnipotence alone can control, all the laws and elements of physical nature; and he expounded, as omniscience alone can expound, all the laws and principles of the moral realm. He turned water into wine, multiplied indefinitely bread and fish, walked on the sea, and calmed the storm; he gave sight to the blind, hearing to the deaf, speech to the dumb, wholeness to the maimed, soundness to the diseased, health to the sick, and life to the dead. He spake as never man spake, with original authority. He was a teacher who set forth original principles, and revealed hidden truths. He was himself the author of the law and the truth. He dominated nature, men, and devils. He is God, the Creator. "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. The same was in the beginning with God. All

things were made by him." He is the Creator and Perpetuator of all things. "For by him were all things created that are in heaven, and that are in earth, visible and invisible, whether they be thrones, or dominions, or principalities, or powers; all things were created by him, and for him; and he is before all things, and by him all things consist."

CHAPTER XI.

REDEMPTION.

THE work of redemption is unique, and is the work peculiar to the Son of God. The nature and character of God, the nature of sin, and the moral condition of the human race, as presented in these pages, constitute the basis of the redemption which is now to be considered and here set forth. The advent of Jesus Christ into the world was for the redemption of the human race. Redemption has been procured and proclaimed through the blood of Jesus Christ. The birth of the Son of Mary was announced as the birth of a Saviour, and he was named Jesus, and was spoken of to those who waited for the consolation and kingdom of God, to all those who looked for redemption in Israel, as the Christ through whom the good tidings of salvation should be proclaimed to all peoples. Jesus was announced and pointed out, by John the Baptist, as "the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world." Jesus himself said: "And as Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, even so must the Son of man be lifted up; that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have eternal life." "And I, if I be lifted up from the earth, will draw all men unto me. This he said, signifying what death he should die." "Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us." "Forasmuch as ye know that ye were not redeemed with corruptible things, as silver and gold, from your vain conversation received by tradition from your fathers; but with the precious blood of Christ, as of a lamb without blemish and without

spot." These last two texts are the utterances of Paul and Peter, giving the doctrine of redemption by Jesus in the profoundest sense.

Jesus Christ is a Saviour and a Redeemer. In love supreme he was born to redeem. Redemption is his special work, and by his death he redeemed the human race. He is the one "in whom we have redemption through his blood." What is redemption? and what is this redemption had through Christ Jesus? These questions are of profoundest import, and call for a definition of the work of Christ in its specific character. Whatever value attaches to faith, experience, and practice; to hope, love, and joy; to being, life, and immortality, attaches to this subject.

Jesus Christ suffered and died as no man ever suffered and died, and as no man, be he apostle or martyr, can ever suffer and die. Persons of all ages and conditions have died—have died in many ways, and from many causes; the young and helpless, the old and feeble, heroes and martyrs, have died; but none have ever died as Jesus died, and no death ever attached to it the significance and purpose which pertain to his death. He is called "the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world." This title is given to him in allusion to the offerings and ceremonies under the patriarchal and Mosaic dispensations, and in allusion to services of fundamental meaning and importance; and he is "the Lamb of God" in a sense in which no other being is, and he takes "away the sin of the world" as no other being takes it away. He is "the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world." Jesus Christ, by the grace of God, tasted death for every man. He, the just one, died for the unjust. He, having no sin of his own, died for the offenses of mankind. He was cut off for sins, but not his own. He, innocent and pure himself and in himself, was hanged on a tree, and was made a curse for the redemption

of Adam and all his posterity—he bearing the punishment of all the sins of the human race in his own body. His blood was shed for the remission of sins, and through his blood, shed in death, redemption is made for and offered to the sons of men. This is duly testified. “To put away sin by the sacrifice of himself,” was the object of his advent into the earth, was the purpose of his assumption of the seed of Abraham.

A proper understanding of the word “redeem” will assist in comprehending the redemption had through the Son of Mary. This word “redeem” is of plain signification, and is easily defined. To redeem is to purchase, repurchase, rescue, deliver. To redeem, or to purchase by substitution, is enjoined in Exodus xxxiv. 20: “The firstling of an ass thou shalt redeem with a lamb.” To redeem, to repurchase, to buy back, is provided for in Leviticus xxv. 48: “After that he is sold he may be redeemed again.” The sense to rescue, or deliver from an enemy, danger, captivity, bondage, evil, and punishment, is given to the term “redeem” in the following passages of the Bible: “In famine he shall redeem thee from death” (Job v. 20); “And I will redeem thee out of the hand of the terrible” (Jer. xv. 21); “And redeemed them from the hand of the enemy” (Ps. cvi. 10); “And redeemed thee out of the house of servants” (Micah vi. 4); “And redeemed you out of the house of bondage” (Deut. xiii. 5). The simple meaning and plain signification of the term “redeem” thus understood and established, it is quite easy to comprehend what the work attributed to Christ is when it is designated the work of redemption, and to understand what is meant when Christ is designated the Redeemer. He has bought the world with a price. He suffered and died for and in the stead of sinners; and he being the God-man, there is in his death infinite merit. By suffering and dying Jesus offered a full satisfaction to divine law and to divine

justice, and made an atonement for the sins of all men. Christ died under law and under penalty. He was executed under judicial process, and the justice of the law of God fell upon him. His sufferings were penal. There can be no proper method of accounting for the agony, suffering, and death of Jesus except on the assumption that he suffered and died to satisfy divine justice, and that penal infliction caused to meet upon him the chastisements due to the iniquities of all men. The Jews and Romans had no legal authority to execute Jesus, inasmuch as he was guilty of no crime against their laws; and their actions in crucifying him were neither righteous nor just, and yet he died under the infliction of a righteous law, and he suffered the penalty due to offended justice. Jesus had no sin of his own for which he deserved to die, being holy, harmless, undefiled, and separate from sinners; and so he died for the sins of others. He suffered death, the penalty due for sin; he suffered the penalty due to others. His death was expiatory and substitutional, propitiatory and vicarious. His death was sacrificial and piacular. It made an atonement in the expiation of guilt.

In constructing their creeds the Pelagians, of all classes, and of all shades of opinion, repudiate and ridicule the doctrine of punitive justice, vicarious suffering, and sacrificial expiation of guilt. They deny that Christ suffered the penalty of justice, and that his death was vicarious and expiatory.

Dr. John Taylor, of Norwich, in his work, "The Scripture Doctrine of Atonement Examined," maintains that "there cannot be a vicarious punishment," that "no one can be punished instead of another," and that "punishment in its very nature connotes guilt in the subject which bears it." (Page 38.) He says: "But is not vicarious punishment, *or the victim's suffering death in the offender's stead, as an equiv-*

alent to divine justice, included in the notion of atonement? Answer, No." (Page 38.) Again he says: "Guilt in its own nature cannot be transferred." (Page 96.) Again: "If the Lawgiver should insist upon vicarious punishment, or require the innocent to die, or accept the voluntary death of the innocent, by way of commutation for the death of the innocent, this seems *more* inconsistent with righteousness and justice, and more remote from all the ends of moral government, than simply to pardon the innocent without any consideration at all." (Page 97.) And yet again, he says: "The design of it [Christ's death] could not be to make God merciful; or to dispose him to spare and pardon us, when, as some suppose, so great was his wrath, that, had not Christ interposed, he would have destroyed us. This is directly contrary to the most plain and certain notions of the divine goodness, and to the whole current of revelation, which always assures us that the pure love of God to a sinful world was the first mover and original spring of the whole of our redemption by Christ. All that Christ did and suffered was by the will and appointment of God; and was conducive to our redemption only in virtue of his will and appointment. Nor can it be true that by his sufferings he satisfied justice, or the law of God. For it is very certain and very evident that *justice* and *law* can no otherwise be satisfied than by the just and legal punishment of the offender." (Pages 93, 94.) He finally tells wherein the virtue and efficacy of Christ's death consist, according to his opinion, in these words: "But the word of God gives us much more just and sublime sentiments, and shows that our Lord's death took its value not from *pain* or *suffering*, *imputation* or *punishment*, but from *obedience* and *goodness*, or the most complete character of all virtue and righteousness, the noblest of all principles, and the highest perfection of intellectual nature." (Page 101.)

In his "Paraphrase and Notes upon the Epistle to the Hebrews," in the twenty-seventh verse of the seventh chapter, on the words "When he offered himself," Dr. A. A. Sykes says: "*Having offered himself. Not as a propitiatory sacrifice, but as having done the will of his Father. To "offer himself" is not to present himself as an expiatory sacrifice to appease God; for God was already so far appeased as to send his Son into the world. There could be no need of reconciling God to man, when he had already shown his love to man so far as to send his Son to reconcile man to God.*"

In his "Theodicy" Dr. Albert Taylor Bledsoe maintains that "the retributive justice of God requires the punishment of the offender, and of no one else; it accepts of no substitute, and it is impossible to conceive that it can be satisfied, except by the punishment of the offender himself; that it is impossible to conceive that our Saviour became liable to the infliction of the retributive justice of God. It is the administrative justice of God that has been satisfied by the atonement which he has made. No satisfaction is made by him to retributive justice." (Page 281.)

He further says: "This [administrative justice] enforces the punishment of the sinner in order to secure the ends of good government, and it is capable of yielding and giving place to any expedient by which those ends may be secured." (Page 281.)

Again, he writes the following: "There is a class of theologians, we are aware, and a very large class, who regard the sufferings of Christ as a satisfaction to the retributive justice of God. But this forms no part of the doctrine which we have undertaken to defend; and indeed we think the defense of such a view of the atonement clearly impossible. . . . We would vindicate the sufferings of Christ no more than those of infants, on the ground that sin was

imputed to him so as to render them just." (Pages 282, 283.)

Once more he says: "According to the sublime idea of revelation, it is the transcendent glory of the cross that it exerts moral influences which have bound the whole intelligent creation together in one harmonious society with God, its Sovereign and all-glorious Head." (Page 207.)

The Rev. Henry W. Bellows, of New York, in his "Restatements of Christian Doctrine," says: "There can be no greater or more blinding heresy than that which would teach that Christ's sufferings, or any sufferings in behalf of virtue and human sins and sorrows, are strictly substitutional, or literally vicarious. . . . Literal substitution of moral penalties is a thing absolutely impossible! Vicarious punishment, in its technical and theological sense, is forbidden by the very laws of our nature and moral constitution." (Pages 306, 307.)

Taylor and Bledsoe, Sykes and Bellows, in common with all other Pelagians, recognize, as they are compelled to do, the existence of justice as an attribute of God, and an attribute which condemns sin and demands the punishment of the sinner; but they all alike parade the idea of God as a Magistrate or Governor exercising a public or administrative justice founded in his love and mercy, and requiring, in the forgiveness of sins, no consideration apart therefrom. This is a mere invention—a simple trick of sophistry. Terms distinctive and descriptive may be proper and useful in the discussion of the atoning work of Christ; and distinctions in the relations of justice there may be, but distinctions which dethrone justice, or make it antagonistic to itself, or in any way change its nature, are not to be allowed. Administrative justice, or justice described by any other term, is not independent of justice inherent in God. The very thing to be done in formulating a creed upon the

redemptive work of Christ is to show how the administration of God in the forgiveness of the sinner harmonizes with that justice which is an attribute of God and of his law. The question to be settled in this connection is this: How can God be just and the justifier of the ungodly? Inventing learned definitions of justice, though intelligent definitions of justice are not to be despised, and extolling God's love and mercy, though his love and mercy in Jesus Christ are worthy of all praise, can never answer this question. The Bible nowhere intimates that Christ satisfied, by his sufferings, administrative justice in contradistinction to retributive justice. The Bible nowhere teaches that Christ relieved the human race of disabilities imposed and demanded by public or administrative justice, but left the race still under the claims and disabilities of unsatisfied retributive justice. According to the position and argument of Dr. Bledsoe, sinners have never been redeemed by Christ nor by any one else from the claims and condemnation of retributive justice; and then, according to the same position and argument, sinners must themselves pay the penalty due to retributive justice by suffering the eternal punishment exacted of and visited upon them, and this without ever having had any help, offer, or hope from Christ; or if they escape this penalty and doom, it is by simple repentance without any satisfaction made to this retributive justice by the sufferings of Christ. And thus Dr. Bledsoe annuls the whole work of Christ's atonement while pretending to attach some importance to it, and while trying to cover up his heresy with the sophistry of an argument. The truth is, if Christ has not made satisfaction to retributive justice, then retributive justice has not been satisfied, and the world is just where it would be without his death.

While Dr. Taylor in his scheme repudiates the doctrine of vicarious punishment, and that Christ suffered death in

the sinner's stead, and as a satisfaction to divine justice, he holds, nevertheless, that there is, under the administration of the Divine Magistrate, virtue in the death of Christ. He teaches that Christ's death is conducive to redemption because of God's will and appointment, and that its efficacy consists in its being a perfect example and pattern of goodness and obedience, having in it, as such, moral power, and a natural and strong tendency as a moral means to affect the mind of the sinner and induce him to seek for holiness. He teaches that the death of Christ has in it efficacy to affect both God and the sinner, just as have the ordinary means of grace, and not otherwise. To use his own words: "Thus also we may form an idea of the *effect* that sacrifices have with God, which cannot well be conceived to be any other than that of prayer and praise, or other expressions of our religious regards, which are pleasing to God as they proceed from or produce good affections in us." "As our prayers are a reason of God's conferring blessings upon us because our prayers are means of producing pious dispositions in our minds, so the blood of *Christ*, or his perfect obedience or righteousness, makes atonement for sin, or is a reason for God's forgiving our sins, because the blood of *Christ* is a means of cleansing us from sin." ("Scripture Doctrine of Atonement," pp. 21, 127.)

So absurd is his scheme, and so false is his logic, that in attempting to show wherein the efficacy of Christ's death consists, Dr. Taylor fails to show what Christ's death is for, and he puts the cause for the effect.

In his Notes on the twenty-seventh verse of the seventh chapter of the Epistle to the Hebrews, Dr. Sykes, as already quoted, says: "*To offer himself*, is not to present himself as an expiatory sacrifice to *appease* God; for God was *already* so far appeased as to *send* his Son into the world. There could be no need of reconciling God to man, when

he had already shown his love to man so far as to send his Son to reconcile man to God."

This is the key-note, by which the whole system of the atonement is modulated by Arians, and all other classes of Pelagians. The system assumes that God is not angry with the transgressor, and is not therefore to be appeased, or reconciled; that his love and mercy to the human race antedate the atonement, and move him to save all who, moved by moral influences and good examples, are reconciled and turn to him.

The opponents of the expiating death of Christ set forth their positions with an amazing confidence, and they strive with a remarkable zeal to make plausible their theory, notwithstanding it is so utterly repugnant to the Holy Scriptures. They quote, with great complacency, in support of their heretical notions, John iii. 16: "For God so loved the world, that he gave his only-begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life."

Mercy is not an attribute of God as are justice and omnipotence. Mercy is an exercise of clemency toward offenders arising in and beginning with the provision of redemption in Christ Jesus. And the mercy of God upon the human race never antedated one hour the assumption by the Son of God of the atoning work of a Saviour. It is true that redemption, as a remedy for the relief of the fallen race, was provided by God, and that in providing this remedy he was moved by his inherent benevolence; but this does not depreciate the work of Christ, nor disprove the expiating efficacy of his death. Justice and mercy meet in the atonement. God was benevolent, not merciful, in making the world. He was benevolent, loving, and merciful in providing for the redemption of the world, and in redeeming it, for it was fallen and criminal, and needed

compassion as it deserved wrath and damnation. There was no propitiating sacrifice required to move and justify God in the creation of the world, but in the work of salvation there was, and without this there could be no salvation. The very text so implicitly relied on to show that there was no necessity for reconciling God to man absolutely carries with it a declaration of merit in Christ, and that a consideration was required and had to be given to secure life to the world, a sacrifice had to be made involving anguish and suffering. The appeasing of the wrath of God was the very purpose for which the Son was sent into the world in the form of a man. God inaugurated the covenant of grace, and voluntarily condescended to make an offer of the same to man, but the *mediation* of Christ was the ground of and reason for all this. The reason for the initiation of salvation, no less than the consummation thereof, is the *mediation* of Christ.

The Bible, in divers manners, teaches that Christ suffered and died to reconcile his Father to man, and to be a sacrifice for sins, and that he suffered death for the redemption of the world, and that by his death he made a sacrifice and satisfaction for the sins of all men, and that those who are saved are accounted righteous by God for his merit alone. Life and salvation are offered to sinners through Jesus Christ as they are not through any other medium. Jesus "through the Eternal Spirit offered himself without spot to God," and he it is "whom God has set forth to be a propitiation," and who is "the propitiation for our sins."

The sacrifices of Abel, Enoch, and Noah; of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob; of Moses, Ithamar, and David; and of Zacharias, Simeon, and Cornelius, were types of the sacrifice made by "the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world;" and the blood of the sacrifices offered by these contrite and devoted worshipers of Jehovah pointed to "the

blood of Christ," and therefrom derived its significance and value. Hence, so many allusions by inspired authors, when speaking of the work of Christ, to the offerings and sacrifices adopted by the law of Moses, and incorporated into its ritual. "For this is my blood of the new testament, which is shed for many for the remission of sins." (Mat. xxvi. 28.) "For even Christ our Passover is sacrificed for us." (1 Cor. v. 7.) "As Christ also hath loved us, and hath given himself for us an offering and a sacrifice to God for a sweet-smelling savor." (Eph. v. 2.) "But Christ being come a high-priest of good things to come, by a greater and more perfect tabernacle, not made with hands, that is to say, not of this building; neither by the blood of goats and calves, but by his own blood he entered in once into the holy place, having obtained eternal redemption for us. For if the blood of bulls and of goats, and the ashes of a heifer sprinkling the unclean, sanctifieth to the purifying of the flesh, how much more shall the blood of Christ, who through the Eternal Spirit offered himself without spot to God, purge your conscience from dead works to serve the living God? And for this cause he is the mediator of the new testament, that by means of death, for the redemption of the transgressions that were under the first testament, they which are called might receive the promise of eternal inheritance. For where a testament is, there must also of necessity be the death of the testator. For a testament is of force after men are dead: otherwise it is of no strength at all while the testator liveth. Whereupon neither the first testament was dedicated without blood. For when Moses had spoken every precept to all the people according to the law, he took the blood of calves and of goats, with water, and scarlet wool, and hyssop, and sprinkled both the book and all the people, saying, This is the blood of the testament which God hath enjoined unto you. Moreover,

he sprinkled likewise with blood both the tabernacle and all the vessels of the ministry. And almost all things are by the law purged with blood; and without shedding of blood is no remission. It was therefore necessary that the patterns of things in the heavens should be purified with these; but the heavenly things themselves with better sacrifices than these. For Christ is not entered into the holy places made with hands, which are the figures of the true; but into heaven itself, now to appear in the presence of God for us: nor yet that he should offer himself often, as the high-priest entereth into the holy place every year with the blood of others; for then must he often have suffered since the foundation of the world; but now once in the end of the world hath he appeared to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself." (Heb. ix. 11-26.) "Forasmuch as ye know that ye were not redeemed with corruptible things, as silver and gold, from your vain conversation received by tradition from your fathers; but with the precious blood of Christ, as of a lamb without blemish and without spot." (1 Peter i. 18, 19.)

These passages are presented here as samples of many others which might be adduced on this feature of the case. The first text here written is constituted of Christ's own words, and gives his own presentation of the subject, and evidently alludes to the shedding of the blood of the sacrifices by the Jews and the patriarchs in their approaches to God, and in making covenants with him. Than the language here used, none could be more comprehensive in presenting the purpose, efficiency, and merit of Christ's death and blood. "*Shed for many for the remission of sins.*" Vicarious; appeasing the divine wrath, purchasing salvation, the cause and ground of the remission of sins. The second text here given, "Christ our Passover is sacrificed for us," is an allusion to the lamb sacrificed in the passover service of the Jewish nation, and is positive authority for the posi-

tion that the paschal lamb was a type of Christ. Christ was offered as a sacrifice to appease the divine displeasure which rested on sinners. The third text here quoted, "And hath given himself for us an offering and sacrifice to God," is an unmistakable reference to the oblations and sacrifices provided for in the ritual service of the Israelites, and establishes the fact that they were types of Christ, and is incontestable evidence of the vicarious offering of Christ, and of his making, by his death, a sacrifice for the purpose of appeasing an offended God. He offered himself to God a sacrifice for guilty men. This unusually long passage, taken from the ninth chapter of the Epistle to the Hebrews, is introduced here because it is a comprehensive presentation of the relation sustained by the sacrifices prescribed by the laws of Moses to that sacrifice of Christ. From this paragraph from the Epistle to the Hebrews it is learned that the whole ritual service, and all the priestly offerings provided for by the Mosaic economy, had specific reference to Christ—typified the oblation and atonement made in and by his blood, and drew all their virtue therefrom. The text quoted from St. Peter is a most beautiful and edifying allusion to the sacrifices required in the worship of God under the Levitical economy. Except upon the proposition that the sacrifices ordained and offered under the Levitical law were types of Christ, the allusion of Peter could have no meaning whatsoever.

Dr. Sykes rejects as untenable and unscriptural the position "that the sacrifices of the law were types of Christ; or that they were allusions to, or even that they had any relation to, his sacrifice." In his argument in defense of his position, the Doctor says: "When two things are compared together by an inspired writer, it does not follow from thence that the one is typical of the other. Allusions do not establish types. It is essential to the notion of a type

that it represents, and was designed to represent, something future." ("Paraphrase and Notes upon the Epistle to the Hebrews," Introduction, pp. 44, 46-48.)

To all this the following reply is just, and is quite sufficient:

1. It is true that a mere allusion to two things together, by an author, does not constitute the things thus alluded to types of each other, but it does not follow from this that the sacrifices enjoined by the law of Moses were not types of the sacrifice made by Christ.

2. It may or it may not be essential to the notion of a type that it represents, and was designed to represent, something future. One way or the other the point under consideration is not thereby affected. It is essential to the notion of a type that it represents the thing in some way of which it is a type. This is little more than a truism. And, moreover, it is not possible to conceive of such a thing as a type without a design; but these do not affect the question involved one way or another.

3. The inspired writers do not speak of the sacrifices provided for in the law of Moses and the sacrifice of Christ as simply having a faint resemblance to each other. In their allusions to the sacrifices of the law in connection with Christ they present the former as types of the latter. They do not compare them as simply having some resemblance to each other.

Dr. Sykes exerted his utmost ability to maintain the position that the sacrifices of the law had no relation to the sacrifice of Christ. He insisted that the sacrifices of the law had an independent purpose, and deriving no efficacy from the sacrifice of Christ, contained in themselves whatever merit pertained thereto, and that they were confined in the purpose and promise thereof to the present life, to civil privileges and offenses, to present temporal possessions,

to earthly goods and political franchises; while the sacrifice of Christ, in its purpose and promise, had reference to spiritual benedictions, to a future life, to an eternal inheritance in heaven. On this behalf he wrote the following sentences: "Nor is it anywhere said that the sacrifices of the law received their *efficacy* from the great sacrifice of Christ." (Page 248.) "The covenant of *Moses* was a covenant which contained the promises of a long life and plenty in the land of *Canaan*. The covenant made by *Christ*, or brought from God and offered to the world by him, was a covenant by which God engaged himself to grant *immortal life* in heaven to all who obeyed the conditions of it." (Page 106.)

These are the positions persistently held by all those who deny the divinity of Jesus, and the penal sufferings thereof—sufferings for appeasing divine wrath and satisfying divine justice. With Dr. Sykes, Dr. John Taylor holds the same positions. He says: "Levitical sacrifices had relation only to this present world, and the political life and state of a *Jew*; as they gave him a right to live and enjoy all the privileges of the land of *Canaan*. But their virtue did not extend to the *conscience*, to free that from guilt before God, or to procure his favor and pardoning mercy. *For it was not possible that the shedding of the blood of bulls and goats, as a mere political institution, should, in this sense, take away sins.* Nor did the Levitical law, thus considered, extend to the *world to come*. For it gave not the least hope or prospect of a resurrection to life, which is the most proper and complete justification or discharge from sin—but after all, rites, services, and sacrifices performed, left a man under the power of death, which is the curse of the law. Its best promises entitled a man only to a temporal, political life; and its threatening was death without hopes of a revival. And thus it left the Jews in their sins, as to

that eternal life which is the gift of God in Jesus Christ our Lord." ("The Scripture Doctrine of Atonement," pp. 72, 73.)

These men—Sykes and Taylor—in their efforts to support their theories, involve themselves in palpable contradictions and absurdities. They pretend to believe and assume to teach that the forgiveness of sins before God and eternal life are secured in and through Jesus Christ; and, at the same time, in their efforts to get rid of appeasing and vicarious sacrifices, they involve themselves in the conclusion that those who lived under the Levitical economy were without any provision for securing the forgiveness of sins committed against the moral law, or for securing the resurrection of the dead, or eternal life. While these authors write the words, "eternal life is the gift of God in Jesus Christ our Lord," their propositions and arguments, couched in actual words, involve the assumption that all who lived anterior to the death of Christ were without the least provision for securing the forgiveness of sins, or the resurrection of the dead, or eternal life; and that all these died without any knowledge of salvation, and without any promise or hope of a future state. For teachers thus to involve themselves in contradictions and absurdities is to refute their own arguments and demolish their own theories. But heretics are always entangled with contradictions and inconsistencies.

It is a truth that "eternal life is the gift of God in Jesus Christ our Lord," a truth which these authors, in any proper sense, do not hold. It is none the less a truth that the generations of men anterior to the death of Christ were clearly within the provisions of redemption—had their being by virtue thereof—and all the benefits of redemption were accessible to them, and all of them who had a knowledge of God had a knowledge of the resurrection of the dead, and

all of them who properly worshiped Jehovah were animated by the hope of a future and blissful immortality. To Adam, the first man, was given, after he had sinned, a full gospel. To him was made by God, a full and complete revelation of the system and work of salvation. The God-man—in his redemptive work, in his conflicts and triumphs—was as clearly and beautifully presented to Adam as to David and Daniel, as to Paul and Peter. Adam was fully instructed in the doctrines of Deity, sin, penalty, atonement, repentance, faith, justification, regeneration, sanctification, resurrection, immortality, judgment, hell, heaven, damnation, and glorification. To Abel, Seth, and Noah, to Abraham, Melchisedek, and Job—in a word, to all God's people in patriarchal and prophetic times—was given a complete revelation of the whole system of redemption. It is not true that patriarchs and prophets groped in darkness, and sought their way by obscure intimations of truth. They were as fully acquainted with the doctrine of the resurrection of the dead and the immortality of the soul as are Christians of the present day. They were as joyous in the experience of sins forgiven, and a soul regenerated, as were Timothy and Paul.

Christ is "Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the end, the first and the last." The gospel of Jesus was preached, and his Church was organized, in the beginning. "In the beginning was the Word." Jesus was present in the capacity of a Saviour with the first generation, as he will be present in the capacity of a Saviour with the last generation of the race of Adam. Abel—of the first generation—approached God by Christ, who is "the way, the truth, and the life." "Enoch also, the seventh from Adam, prophesied of these, saying, Behold, the Lord cometh with ten thousand of his saints, to execute judgment upon all, and to convince all that are ungodly among them of all their

ungodly deeds which they have ungodly committed, and of all their hard speeches which ungodly sinners have spoken against him." (Jude 14.) "Enoch walked with God; and he was not; for God took him." (Gen. v. 24.) "By faith Enoch was translated, that he should not see death; and was not found, because God had translated him; for before his translation he had this testimony, that he pleased God." (Heb. xi. 5.) This man Enoch lived in the seventh generation from Adam. He knew, believed, obeyed, enjoyed, and preached the gospel of Christ. The triumphs of the gospel, the end of time, the proceedings of the general judgment, the awards which will be meted to men in the future state, were themes with which Enoch was familiar, and upon which he discoursed to the congregations of his day. Than Enoch no one ever had a deeper knowledge of Christ, a richer Christian experience, a sublimer destiny, or a grander end. That he who prophesied of the triumphs of the Lord attended by the multitudes of his saints, proclaimed and portrayed the transactions of the day of judgment, was so obedient to the ordinances of God that he had the testimony that he pleased him, had such faith that he was translated to heaven that he should not die, was without the promise of the forgiveness of sins and the hope of eternal life, no one can believe except a heretic.

Noah, who lived prior to the flood as well as after it, was, as is learned from the apostle Peter, "a preacher of righteousness." Here were the things which pertain to a spiritual kingdom, the things which purify the conscience, and guarantee justification and eternal life. Noah was "heir of the righteousness which is by faith." This embodies the highest Christian attainment in this life, and gives promise of the highest felicity in the life to come. "The righteousness which is by faith" is the righteousness which Noah preached to the antediluvians, and it has its origin and

source in Jesus, and can be preached through and drawn from him only. Noah preached the same gospel which was preached by Paul, Silas, and others of their day.

Abraham, though living two thousand years before the advent, possessed a perfect knowledge of Jesus and the resurrection, and had faith and joy in the same. Jesus said: "Abraham rejoiced to see my day; and he saw it, and was glad." (John viii. 56.) The apostle said: "By faith Abraham, when he was tried, offered up Isaac; accounting that God was able to raise him up, even from the dead." (Heb. xi. 17, 19.) Abraham believed. In whom did he believe? In Jesus, who said, "I am the resurrection and the life." He offered sacrifices through him, sung praises to his name, rejoiced in his triumphs and shouted over his victories. He was as happy in the renewing and saving grace of Jesus imparted by the Holy Ghost, and rejoiced therein as constantly as were and did the chosen apostles. He looked forward to the time when he would put off his earthly tabernacle, and be clothed upon with his house which is from heaven, with as much anticipation and assurance as did Paul and the pious of Paul's day. The author of the Epistle to the Hebrews teaches this. In the eleventh chapter of this Epistle he names some of the saints and worthies of patriarchal and prophetic times, among them Abraham, and says of them: "These all died in the faith, not having received the promises, but having seen them afar off, and were persuaded of them and embraced them, and confessed that they were strangers and pilgrims on the earth. For they that say such things declare plainly that they seek a country. And truly, if they had been mindful of that country from whence they came out, they might have had opportunity to have returned. But now they desire a better country, that is, a heavenly; wherefore God is not ashamed to be called their God; for he hath prepared for them a city." "And these

all, having obtained a good report through faith, received not the promise: God having provided some better thing for us, that they without us should not be made perfect." (Verses 13-16, 39, 40.) The promises made to these saints and worthies of past ages, the blessings of which, in their consummation, they had not received before they died, were those pertaining to eternal life—to an inheritance consummated in heaven. The consummation of these promises shall be attained when all the redeemed of every generation and clime shall be gathered into the paradise of God,

Where the saints of all ages in harmony meet.

Moses knew of Christ the Messiah, believed in and received him as his Saviour, renouncing therefor honors and riches in Egypt, and wrote of and prophesied concerning him. "By faith Moses, when he was come to years, refused to be called the son of Pharaoh's daughter; esteeming the reproach of Christ greater riches than the treasures of Egypt." (Heb. xi. 24-26.) Christ and his reproach are here named as included in the choice of Moses. Had he been ignorant of Christ and the reward with which Christ would recompense him, he could not have esteemed the reproach thereof greater riches than the treasure at his disposal in Egypt.

While led by Moses in the wilderness, the children of Israel had Christ with them, and were nourished and refreshed by him. "For they drank of that spiritual rock that followed them; and that rock was Christ." (1 Cor. x. 4.) This demolishes the theory that the promises of God to this people were confined to milk and honey, and political franchises in the land of Canaan.

The subject of the Old Testament Scriptures as well as that of the New Testament is Christ the Redeemer of the world. He is the theme upon which the law, the Psalms, and the prophets everywhere discourse. "Philip

findeth Nathanael, and saith unto him, We have found him of whom Moses in the law, and the prophets, did write, Jesus of Nazareth, the son of Joseph." (John i. 45.) "To him give all the prophets witness, that through his name whosoever believeth in him shall receive remission of sins." (Acts x. 43.) Prophets and priests, by both message and sacrifice, constantly proclaimed the Christ. Many passages in the Old Testament are but the texts upon which and from which the prophets preached profound and exhaustive sermons—sermons which embodied every theme of gospel truth. Christ is the Saviour of men, and the only Saviour. This much concerning him Peter declared to the rulers of the people and the elders of Israel: "Neither is there salvation in any other; for there is none other name under heaven given among men whereby we must be saved." (Acts iv. 12.) This passage of Scripture is so comprehensive that it includes all climes, and is applicable to all times. Salvation can be obtained alone in Jesus Christ. This was as true in the time of Moses as in the time of Peter, and consequently if men were not saved in the time of Moses and of Ezekiel, and in the time of Noah and Abraham by Christ, they were not saved at all. The gospel of Christ hath been preached beginning with the very first generation of the race, and to all generations Jesus hath, through this gospel, brought life and immortality to light. The cross of the Lord Jesus Christ on Calvary stands in the middle of the ages, and to it the eyes of all generations have turned, and in it the pious of all generations have gloried. Peter and Paul, Stephen and John, are no more sinners saved by grace, and are no more Christians crowned in heaven, than are Abel and Abraham, Enoch and Elijah.

The Pentateuch embodies and announces the gospel of Jesus Christ in its provisions of mercy and its offers of pardon as clearly and directly as does the Sermon on the Mount;

and the claims of God and the demands of his law, and the necessity of making satisfaction to divine justice before the guilty can be released from the penalty attached to crime, are plainly presented in the Pentateuch. "And the Lord passed by before him, and proclaimed, The Lord, the Lord God, merciful and gracious, long-suffering and abundant in goodness and truth, keeping mercy for thousands, forgiving iniquity and transgression and sin, and that will by no means clear the guilty." (Ex. xxxiv. 6, 7.) The grandeur and power, the majesty and glory of Jehovah are here displayed, but his redeeming grace is proclaimed as well. There is nowhere a loftier conception or a sublimer portraiture of Christ in his work of mediation than is here recorded. The Epistles of the New Testament do not exceed the Pentateuch in the loftiness of their promises and the minuteness of their descriptions of a spiritual heritage.

Deliverance from sin is on the basis of merit existing and accepted. The Scriptures connect salvation, in its offer and bestowment, with a *reason*. A *price* is always named as a consideration wherever there is a tender of pardon, and of immunity from punishment. That *merit* is the *merit* of the suffering Son of God, that *reason* his *death*, that *price* his *blood*. The Bible nowhere teaches that sins are forgiven because God is good, or loving, or merciful, or long-suffering. It is nowhere said that God so loved the world that he forgave the sin thereof, nowhere said that he is so lenient that he justifies the ungodly. But the following are specimens of the utterances of the Scriptures: "For God so loved the world that he gave his only-begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life." (John iii. 16.) "Him hath God exalted with his right-hand to be a Prince and a Saviour, for to give repentance to Israel, and forgiveness of sins. . . Be it known unto you therefore, men and brethren, that through this

man is preached unto you the forgiveness of sins." (Acts v. 31; xiii. 38.) "Being justified freely by his grace, through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus: whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation through faith in his blood, to declare his righteousness for the remission of sins that are past through the forbearance of God; to declare, I say, at this time his righteousness; that he might be just, and the justifier of him which believeth in Jesus. . . . Who was delivered for our offenses, and was raised again for our justification. Therefore, being justified by faith, we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ" (Rom. iii. 24-26; iv. 25; v. 1.) "In whom we have redemption through his blood, the forgiveness of sins, according to the riches of his grace." (Eph. i. 7.) "For there is one God and one mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus; who gave himself a ransom for all, to be testified in due time." (1 Tim. ii. 5, 6.) "Wherefore Jesus also, that he might sanctify the people with his own blood, suffered without the gate." (Heb. xiii. 12.) "For Christ also hath once suffered for sins, the just for the unjust, that he might bring us to God, being put to death in the flesh, but quickened by the Spirit." (1 Pet. iii. 18.) "And the blood of Jesus Christ his Son cleanseth us from all sin." (1 John i. 7.)

In language concise, comprehensive, conspicuous, and most beautiful, the Bible teaches that Jesus died to redeem and save sinners. He was made under the law, was made to be sin for sinners, was made a curse for sinners; he offered one sacrifice, and suffered once for sins; in his own person on the cross he bore the sins of the guilty; he died for sins, he died for sinners, and by the sacrifice of himself he put away sin. Upon him were laid the sins of the world, and he endured the penalty thereof. He suffered the penalty of the violated law, and by his death made satisfaction to offended justice, and propitiated an angry God. He satis-

fied divine justice by suffering the punishment due to the sins of the fallen race. In attestation thereof the following texts are adduced. Many, very many others equally conclusive might be given: "Surely he hath borne our griefs, and carried our sorrows; yet we did esteem him stricken, smitten of God, and afflicted. But he was wounded for our transgressions, he was bruised for our iniquities; the chastisement of our peace was upon him; and with his stripes we are healed. All we like sheep have gone astray; we have turned every one to his own way; and the Lord hath laid on him the iniquity of us all. He was oppressed, and he was afflicted, yet he opened not his mouth; he is brought as a lamb to the slaughter, and as a sheep before her shearers is dumb, so he openeth not his mouth. He was taken from prison and from judgment; and who shall declare his generation? for he was cut off out of the land of the living; for the transgression of my people was he stricken. And he made his grave with the wicked, and with the rich in his death; because he had done no violence, neither was any deceit in his mouth. Yet it pleased the Lord to bruise him; he hath put him to grief; when thou shalt make his soul an offering for sin, he shall see his seed, he shall prolong his days, and the pleasure of the Lord shall prosper in his hand. He shall see of the travail of his soul, and shall be satisfied; by his knowledge shall my righteous servant justify many; for he shall bear their iniquities." (Isa. liii. 4-11.) "Even as the Son of man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give his life a ransom for many." (Matt. xx. 28.) "For this is my blood of the new testament, which is shed for many for the remission of sins." (Matt. xxvi. 28.) "Now it was not written for his sake alone that it was imputed to him; but for us also, to whom it shall be imputed, if we believe on him that raised up Jesus our Lord from the dead; who was delivered for

our offenses, and was raised again for our justification." (Rom. iv. 23-25.) "Destroy not him with thy meat, for whom Christ died." (Rom. xiv. 15.) "For I delivered unto you first of all that which I also received, how that Christ died for our sins according to the Scriptures." (1 Cor. xv. 3.) "For he hath made him to be sin for us, who knew no sin; that we might be made the righteousness of God in him." (2 Cor. v. 21.) "And from our Lord Jesus Christ, who gave himself for our sins." (Gal. i. 3, 4.) "Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us." (Gal. iii. 13.) "God sent forth his Son, made of a woman, made under the law, to redeem them that were under the law, that we might receive the adoption of sons." (Gal. iv. 4, 5.) "Who his own self bare our sins in his own body on the tree." (1 Peter ii. 24.) "For Christ also hath once suffered for sins, the just for the unjust, that he might bring us to God." (1 Peter iii. 18.) "And he is the propitiation for our sins; and not for ours only, but also for the sins of the whole world." (1 John ii. 2.)

These texts of the Holy Scriptures, in their undisguised meaning, support the theory in redemption which insists on penalty, punishment, substitution, satisfaction, and establish the evangelical doctrine of the atonement. There is no possible ground upon which to question the reference of the fifty-third chapter of Isaiah to Jesus. The New Testament settles this reference conclusively. Many passages might be cited in support of this position that the reference is to Jesus, but Acts viii. 32-36 is sufficiently conclusive in itself, and Dr. Carpenter, notwithstanding his effort to refute the doctrine that Jesus is very God, and to demolish the theory of the vicarious and propitiating sufferings of Christ, admits in his book, "A View of the Scriptural Grounds of Unitarianism," that 1 Peter ii. 24 "contains an obvious reference to Isaiah liii., in which are described the suffer-

ings of Jesus and the purposes of them." (Page 327.) No language could be framed, no sentences could be formed, which would express more forcibly the visitation of penalty and the infliction of punishment upon one person for another than is done by the language of Isaiah in this fifty-third chapter of his prophecies. It would be impossible to teach more clearly and positively the substitution of one person for another in bearing sin, in suffering punishment, in paying penalty, and in satisfying justice, than is done here by Isaiah. According to this inspired word here recorded the guilt of sinners was imputed to Jesus, and the punishment due to the same was visited upon him; and this was done by God himself. "The Lord hath laid on him the iniquity of us all." Jesus, in his own person, bore the guilt incurred by the sins of men; and he, in his own person, suffered the punishment justly due to the offenses committed against the divine law, and by his atoning death procured help and hope, healing and health, for a sinful race. The other passages given above from the Scriptures teach the same things, with equal emphasis, that are taught by the quotation from Isaiah.

All those who espouse the doctrines of Pelagianism, Arminianism, and Unitarianism, reject and denounce vicarious suffering, penal satisfaction, and every other point belonging to the theory of a proper atonement. Some men having membership and receiving emoluments as Methodists, and professing to hold and expound the Arminian creed, denounce the doctrines of vicarious suffering and penal satisfaction as irreconcilable to human reason, as inconsistent with human goodness, as absolutely revolting to the common instincts and feelings of the human heart. Infidels and heretics constantly appeal to human reason and human goodness in support of their theories, though they never accord with the one or protect and advance the other.

Some men having membership as Methodists have written and have had published books in which they have made statements and advocated positions which either disparage their own intelligence or discredit their own veracity. Vicarious suffering and penal satisfaction cannot be eliminated from a scriptural theory of atonement—cannot be expunged from the beautiful system of Arminianism. Vicarious suffering and penal satisfaction cannot be made to fit into the systems of Arianism and Unitarianism; and hence all who espouse the doctrines of these systems repudiate vicarious suffering and penal satisfaction.

Dr. Carpenter, an avowed Unitarian, laboring to refute the doctrines that Christ is a divine person, and that his death made a proper satisfaction for the sins of men, and has immediate efficacy in securing salvation, says: "I cannot hesitate in saying with the apostle that we have forgiveness of sins by means of his blood or death; but what this has to do with the doctrines of vicarious punishment and satisfaction I cannot perceive." "The doctrines of satisfaction and vicarious punishment, followed to their just conclusions, destroy the force of Christian sanctions." "The doctrines of satisfaction and vicarious punishment are the chief support of the doctrine of the proper deity of Christ, and that on the other hand supports them." ("Scripture Grounds of Unitarianism," pp. 323, 346, 348.)

All this is said in support of the scheme of Unitarianism, a scheme which denies the divinity of Christ, and which denies that his death made a proper satisfaction to offended justice and violated law. Let special notice be given to the fact that this Unitarian here quoted insists that the death of Jesus is a *means* of, not a *reason* for, the forgiveness of sins. Let those Methodists who, when discussing the questions of sin and atonement, renounce and denounce as a doctrine the satisfaction made by the death of Christ, con-

sider in what company they are found, and with what scheme they ally themselves. The Unitarian scheme, which denies inbred sin, the divinity of Jesus, that he suffered punishment in the place of sinners, and that by his death he made satisfaction to divine justice, is none the less heretical and false because it is advocated by some men who have what importance they possess by being called Methodists. Men who sail under false colors are rather to be spurned than trusted. The Methodist Episcopal Church, South, the Wesleyan Methodist Church in England, and other leading Methodist Churches, are evangelical in doctrines, are Arminian in creed. These leading Methodist Churches, in their creeds and recognized standards, teach the fall of Adam and his posterity together, the doctrine of inbred sin, the divinity of Jesus Christ—that his death was necessary for the forgiveness of sins, and could not be substituted with some other provision in the divine economy; that he died in the place of sinners, and that his death made satisfaction to divine justice, and in consideration thereof God is placable.

That the Methodists of America believe and teach that the death of Christ made satisfaction for the sins of men, that they hold the theory of satisfaction to the exclusion of all opposing theories, is evinced by an absolute declaration in their articles of religion, found in their books of discipline. Article XX. contains the following: "The offering of Christ, once made, is that perfect redemption, propitiation, and satisfaction for all the sins of the whole world, both original and actual; and there is none other satisfaction for sin but that alone."

Dr. Carpenter, true to his theory, on page 315 of his book, says: "The death of Jesus was a necessary yet voluntary means of furnishing those aids by which men were purified from their sins." It is true that the death of Christ was voluntary. He voluntarily submitted to death. He,

According to his own words, voluntarily surrendered his life. "No man taketh it from me, but I lay it down of myself." That Jesus had power and authority to lay down his life, and that he did voluntarily submit to death, shall constantly be maintained in these pages as a truth; but the point now insisted on is that the death of Jesus was not simply a means of furnishing aid to men in escaping from sin, but that it was a necessary ground, and a meritorious reason for deliverance from guilt and punishment. The Scriptures, in presenting and describing the nature and purposes of the death of Christ, use the terms "ransom," "redeem," "bought," "purchase." Jesus "gave himself a ransom for all," and "hath redeemed us from the curse of the law." The "purchased inheritance" is mentioned, and it is said "he hath purchased with his own blood" the Church of God. There is in the death of Christ a value, a merit; it has a purchasing, a procuring, a conferring power. His death was not simply a ratification of a covenant, but it was literally a propitiatory sacrifice. Men are commanded to "believe on the Lord Jesus Christ," with the promise that they "shall be saved," and "through faith in his blood" the "remission of sins" is obtained. The death of Christ is thus invested with power and purpose unknown to means and ordinances. Prayers, songs, alms, and ordinances are right in themselves, are enjoined as works and duties, and are, in their measure, pleasing to God and profitable to those who use them; but nowhere are men commanded to believe in these means of grace and acts of devotion. Nowhere has it been said, Believe on prayer and you shall be saved; nowhere has it been said, Believe on ceremonies and ordinances and you shall receive remission of sins; nowhere has it been said, The Church of God has been purchased with the songs of Zion; nowhere has it been said, You have been redeemed with the praises of the as-

sembly. There is therefore an intrinsic value belonging to the blood of Christ which does not inhere in conventional ceremonies and carnal ordinances, however beautiful, proper, and influential they may be.

Dr. Carpenter takes occasion to translate the Greek text of the twenty-fifth verse of the fourth chapter of Romans. The Authorized Version has it: "Who was delivered for our offenses, and was raised again for our justification." Dr. Carpenter gives it: "Who was delivered up on account of ($\delta\iota\alpha$) our sins, and was raised on account of ($\delta\iota\alpha$) our justification." After giving this translation he makes an exposition of the text, and says: "The first clause expresses two things: that it was on account of sins that Jesus died; and that it was for sins of others, not his own." ("Scripture Grounds of Unitarianism," p. 317.) By translating in this way the Greek preposition $\delta\iota\alpha$, and by commenting in this manner upon the text, this Unitarian endeavors to weaken the force and destroy the authority of the passage in teaching the vicarious death of our Lord Jesus Christ. But the effort displays its own futility. This Greek preposition, $\delta\iota\alpha$, has several meanings, such as "through," "by," "at," "from," "for." "On account of" is a sense in which it is sometimes used, but it will not bear this sense in this text now under consideration. The resurrection of Jesus was not on account of the justification of men, as though he was raised because men were justified, but his resurrection was in order to the justification of men, he was raised up that they might be raised up. The resurrection of Jesus was not the result of the justification, but the justification was to follow as the result of his resurrection. The preposition is, therefore, properly translated by the English preposition "for." It is readily conceded, and shall be firmly maintained, that Jesus died "for the sins of others, not his own." "He was delivered *for our offenses.*"

Still intending to impair the force and destroy the authority of the passages which contain such terms as "Christ died for us," and "Christ died for the ungodly," Dr. Carpenter enters into an examination and gives a criticism of a part of the fifteenth verse of the fourteenth chapter of Romans: "Destroy not him with thy meat for whom Christ died." Upon these words the shifty Doctor remarks: "If it had been clearly said that Christ died in our stead, I do not perceive that it would have justified the idea that he was *punished* in our stead. But the fact is that the expression actually found in this and other similar passages is exceedingly general, and denotes no more than that Jesus died for our benefit." Then, after naming what he says "are the principal, if not all, of the other texts in which the death of Jesus is spoken of as being *for us, for men, for the ungodly,*" he says: "The obvious force of the preposition $\delta\pi\epsilon\rho$ is *protection.*" (Pages 319, 320.) Such interpretations and criticisms of the Holy Scriptures suggest the presence of those who, professing themselves to be wise, became fools, and in their unrighteousness perverted the truth of God. The Greek preposition $\delta\pi\epsilon\rho$ has several significations, such as "on," "upon," "instead of," "for," and its meaning is not to be lost sight of and perverted by emphasizing the word "protection." This preposition ($\delta\pi\epsilon\rho$), used in so many passages of the Scriptures when the sufferings and death of Jesus are mentioned, does make these passages say clearly that Christ died for, instead of, sinners; died for, instead of, the ungodly. But suppose it be granted that Christ died "on *account of*" sins, died "on *account of*" the ungodly, what then? His death was, nevertheless, to make satisfaction for sins, and was for the purpose of redeeming the ungodly from the guilt and punishment due to their sins. As death is the penalty of sin, and Jesus suffered death for sins and for sinners, the idea that he was punished

for and instead of sinners is fully justified. The truth is, "it has been clearly said that Christ died in our stead." In the same book, from which so many quotations have been made, at page 321, Dr. Carpenter, commenting on the text "For he hath made him to be sin for us," says: "Jesus was made sin, inasmuch as he was treated as a sinner." This is enough. If Jesus was treated as a sinner, then was he punished, for sinners are punished; and if he was treated as a sinner, then he was so treated for, instead of, sinners—for Jesus was not a sinner himself. If he was treated as a sinner, and was not so treated as in the place of others who were sinners, then he was treated unjustly, not being a sinner himself.

All the tribes who renounce the doctrines of original or birth sin, the divinity of Jesus Christ, the necessity of regeneration originating in native depravity, unite in renouncing the doctrine of satisfaction to divine justice by the death of Christ. All the schemes of all these tribes coalesce in opposing the doctrine of satisfaction. Whether what is known as the "moral influence system," or what is called the "governmental theory," is marshaled into service, it is all the same; both of these theories, with all kindred theories, have been instituted in opposition to the great Bible doctrine of satisfaction.

An effort has been made to disguise heresy and to undermine the system of divine truth by advocating, in the name of Methodism and Arminianism, what is called the "Governmental Theory of Atonement." In this effort to disguise heresy the assertion has been made that the Arminian system repudiates the theory of satisfaction and holds the governmental theory, and also that Methodist standards of highest authority reject the theory of satisfaction and accept and defend the governmental theory.

The theory of satisfaction is the theory adopted and de-

fended by Arminians, and by all Arminian Methodists, and is the theory taught in the Holy Scriptures.

This theory of satisfaction is defended here, not because it abnegates the divine law and annihilates the divine government, but because it is the theory upon which the Scriptures vindicate the divine law and establish the divine government, while extending amnesty and salvation to a revolted and sinful race. Verily, there is divine law and divine government. There are divine rights and human interests. God is a Governor, with rights and prerogatives all his own; and when he created beings, put them under law, and made them amenable to moral government, he invested them with eternal interests all their own; and under his sovereignty there is an enforcement of law and an administration of government in which absolute regard is constantly had to the rights of God, and in which the interests of his creatures are never imperiled. It must not, however, be forgotten that man is fallen and sinful, his rights having been forfeited, and his interests having been sacrificed, not by God, not by the result of his administration, but by the disobedience of man himself. There are law, government, administration, rights, and interests; it is nevertheless true that these cannot be and at the same time sin be forgiven, while as yet no satisfaction has been made to violated law and offended justice. This so-called governmental theory of atonement endeavors by its own terms to, and carried to its own conclusions would, annul law, demolish the divine government, and enthrone sin. The theory of satisfaction is the correct theory in that it recognizes the demerit of sin, and the actuality of government, establishes law, and vindicates the divine administration in the salvation of sinners. With sin and law there is no accordance. God, in his administration, must harmonize with his own law. Sin

impinges the law of God; if it did not there would be no occasion for its punishment, there would be no occasion for its forgiveness; and, consequently, the law cannot be maintained and sin forgiven in the absence of satisfaction made for the impingement; and therefore the administration of God would be antagonistic to the just and absolute demands of his own law did he forgive sins without satisfaction made thereto by penalty inflicted and endured. In the very nature of the case, righteous law, divine law, cannot be annulled, and no theory can be true which abrogates the claims thereof. The divine law is like God himself, and, in the very nature of the case, cannot violate itself, and it cannot provide for its own violation, and it cannot approve when it has been violated. For law to provide for a violation of itself, or for it to approve the violation when occurring, would be as great a contradiction and as positive an absurdity as for God to lie, or annihilate himself. The divine administration may not antagonize the divine law, and so God must punish sin in all cases; and he must punish it in those lying under its guilt, or find a ransom in a substitute. Was it possible to find a proper substitute? Was it possible to find one who could take, in the penalty of the law, the place of those who have sinned? Yes; and it has been done. The Bible teaches that Christ has been "made sin for us," and hath "borne our offenses." By his death Christ made satisfaction to an offended God and a violated law, and for this reason pardon is offered and salvation is given. Salvation is through and by the death of Christ. By this method the law is maintained, justice is done, men are saved, and God is glorified.

It is admitted here and now that there is nothing in the universe like the substitution and satisfaction of Jesus. It is vain to search in human administrations, in human ex-

pedients, for any thing having resemblance. There is nothing analogous. Similitudes and synonyms are unknown here; attempts at illustration are all futile. Attempts have been made by many who have written upon theological subjects to illustrate the promptings and principles which moved and controlled Jehovah in the provisions of the atonement, and thus to illustrate the nature of the atonement itself. It has become fashionable to introduce Zaleucus to illustrate these points. The history—supposing it to be history—is that Zaleucus was at one time the lawgiver and king of the Locrians. He enacted a law against adultery, and gave it force by attaching to its violation a penalty. Whoever violated this law was to be punished by having both eyes put out. The son of the king violated the law, and subjected himself to the penalty. When the case came to adjudication and execution, the king and father, as an expedient in the disposition of the case, put out but one of his son's eyes, and instead of the other put out one of his own. It is insisted that in this way the father and king showed proper affection and leniency for his son, and just regard for the authority of his law. Those who reject the doctrine of satisfaction and advocate the governmental theory of the divine atonement, insist that this case of Zaleucus and his son is a case of proper substitution, having a close analogy to the divine atonement, and that it is an estimable illustration of the harmonious action of God's mercy and justice, and of the substitution of Christ's sufferings for sinners. But the case of Zaleucus and his son has no analogy whatever to God the Father and Christ the Son in the great scheme of human redemption. This, the extensive use made of the case, and the great praise bestowed on the conduct of Zaleucus in the matter, to the contrary notwithstanding. Christ the Son was not a criminal deserving punishment, and God the

Father did not suffer and endure punishment as a substitute, dividing the penalty with Christ, and the case in no way illustrates the atoning work of the Son of God. It is really unaccountable that this case should ever have been brought forward for such purpose. In putting out one of his own eyes, this king simply visited upon himself a cruel infliction for which he had no authority; the act at best was nothing more than a reckless mockery of justice. Penalty cannot be divided out between parties—one-half put upon the criminal by killing one side of him, and the other half put upon some other person by killing one side of him. This king had no more right to put out his own eye than he had to cut off his own head. In sparing one of the eyes of his son, he simply released the son from the penalty of the law, and having no authority to do this, he mocked and violated the law in a most palpable manner. Truly, this transaction "was not in any sense retributive," and "was not penal," and "was above law;" for it was a criminal transaction throughout. As it was a solemn farce, as it was a defiant suppression of law, as it was a reckless breach of justice, it could not "answer for the rectoral office of penalty." Law cannot be administered by breaking it, nor upheld by trampling on it. Clearing the guilty, however it may be accompanied by blind inflictions upon others, will never support the authority of law, will never exalt and vindicate justice, and can never manifest and illustrate the harmony and poise of the divine mercy and justice.

It is reported that a teacher, whose name is given as Bronson Alcott, did, for the enforcement of his rules and the maintenance of his authority as a master, submit in his own person to the penalty due to an offending pupil, receiving the chastisement at the hands of the pupil who had committed the offense. This case has been presented by those who denounce the doctrine of satisfaction in the divine

atonement as a case of substitution analogous to the substitution of Christ, and as an admirable illustration of the nature of the atonement made by the Son of God. It is insisted, by those presenting the case, that this method of administration adopted in this case by this teacher is well adapted to disciplinary ends, and well calculated to maintain the authority of law, and to secure from those under the administration reverence and obedience. But, in all seriousness, nothing could be more erratic than such a procedure in government and discipline. Surely, nothing could be better for bringing law, authority, and administrator into contempt than such a course as this. Nothing could encourage a wayward and vindictive pupil in rebellion and crime more than this method of administration here reported. So soon as some petty animosity against the teacher should possess the pupil he would commit some offense deserving flagellation that he might whip the teacher and gratify his animosity. And such an illustration of the divine methods and of the sacred mysteries as this is simply contemptible. Would as well present as an illustration of the saving work of atonement some fabled feat of "the goddess of the chase," in bounding over hill and dale in pursuit of flying game, or the fabulous acts of the fabled Hercules in bearing "with fortitude whatever gods or men imposed upon him." These theories of atonement which repudiate the satisfaction made in Christ's death were born in heresy, and have been nurtured by heretics—have been nurtured by those destitute of lofty conceptions of the enormity of sin, the dignity of law, the inflexibility of justice, and the rectitude and majesty of God; and these, the theories and their defenders, have contributed what they could—very much, indeed—in supporting the speculations which treat with contempt the sublime doctrines of the divinity of Christ, and the personality and divinity of the Holy Ghost.

Redemption is a subject lying outside of the realm of comparison; it is infinitely removed from all illustration. The sublime and mysterious work of redeeming the human race rested alone upon Jesus Christ, the Son of God. He alone was competent to the work. His death was necessary, and his life was voluntarily surrendered. He voluntarily laid down his life; he voluntarily died to make an oblation and satisfaction for the sins of mankind. "I lay down my life, that I might take it again. No man taketh it from me, but I lay it down of myself. I have power to lay it down, and I have power to take it again." (John x. 17, 18.) Men have received their being from a source outside of themselves; therefore, if any merely human person were to assume to give his life to redeem others from their sins, he would assume to give what he had received, he would assume prerogatives not belonging to him, and would offend against the author of his being. But as Christ was God—the I Am—having life in himself, and from himself, he could give his life a sacrifice for others without offending. Christ had—as no one besides ever had, and as no one else could have—the authority and power to give himself a ransom for others. His infinite relations made it proper for him to give his life a ransom for the sins of others, and his infinite relations and his divine nature invested his death with merits equal to the necessities and purposes involved in the case. He had—self-existing as he did—power over his own life, and he had authority to dispose of it. His power and authority over his own life were such that it was no crime against the infinite and just laws existing in the infinite relations of things for him to dispose of his life for the benevolent purposes of human salvation. He could do what no other person, under any circumstances could do: he could represent God and man—the parties concerned in the demands of the case—in the rec-

oneiliation to be effected. Uniting in his person the natures of the divine and the human, he could, and he did, standing as a daysman betwixt them, represent God, whose authority had been set at naught, and man, who had offended against the Lord Almighty.

There was in Jesus a mysterious combination of weakness and power, and of power in weakness. In him were the infirmities of human flesh and the perfections of divinity. In him there was a power in the infirmities permissive of death. In all the universe no one but Jesus combined in himself the capacity to die and the power to live; none but he could die, and by his own power live again. He died, he revived; he laid down his life, he resumed it; he died, he rose from the dead; he passed down into the very dominions of death, and returned, leading captivity captive. Having laid down his own life, he resumed it. He, by his own power, rose from the dead. Had he failed to rise from the dead, meager indeed would have been the narrative of his achievements; the crucifixion would have been—what his enemies intended it should be—the attestation of his impotence and of his infamy; the claim of redemptive power would have stood an imposition and a fraud, and the whole scheme of salvation would have been ridiculous and a failure. His resumption of his life was a justification of his claim of Messiahship, a verification of the efficiency and merit of his death. His resumption of his life proved that he came out from God to redeem the world, and that he had power over death and hell. He was strong to redeem and mighty to save.

The darkened sun, the quaking earth, the rending rocks, his bloody sweat, his tears, his sighs, his groans, attest that Jesus suffered. The Bible affirms that he suffered for sins, suffered for the unjust. Civilians and warriors, friends and foes, Jews and Gentiles, assert that he died. The

Scriptures declare that he died for sins, died for the ungodly: "For to this end Christ both died, and rose, and revived, that he might be Lord both of the dead and living." "And if any man sin, we have an advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous; and he is the propitiation for our sins; and not for ours only, but also for the sins of the whole world." (1 John ii. 1, 2.) Substitution, satisfaction, penalty, punishment, appeasing divine wrath, and reconciling God to sinners—these points, all and each, are embodied, expressed and asserted by the apostle John in this text. That Jesus died for sinners, that he endured in his own person the penalty—the punishment due to sin—and made thereby satisfaction to violated law and offended justice, that Christ suffered and died to reconcile his Father to sinners, this text most comprehensively and plainly asserts. Gethsemane and Olivet, Calvary and the cross, all unite in testifying to the same great truths. No caricature of God's righteous indignation against sin, and of his burning wrath against transgression, can destroy the meaning and force of this text, or mar the beauty and grandeur of the redemptive work of Jesus Christ, the Man of sorrows and the Lord of glory. Jesus is the Redeemer, the Saviour; *he is the propitiation for the sins of the whole world*; he is ever with the Father as an Advocate, presenting and pleading his atoning blood as a cause and reason for the remission of sins and the salvation of sinners. The blood of expiation, the blood "of the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world," gives access to the mercy-seat, gives access to the tree of life which is in the paradise of God.

This doctrine of satisfaction made to violated law and offended justice, this theory of a "perfect and sufficient sacrifice, oblation, and satisfaction for the sins of the whole world," has nothing to do with the commercial idea of

atonement, has nothing to do with the theory of a price which pays dollar for dollar, commodity for commodity. There is an infinite merit in the satisfaction made by Jesus. The price is complete, sufficient, available. The expiation made for the remission of sins was finished by Christ upon the cross. The offering was made, the satisfaction was rendered; the work was finished; the atonement is complete. The satisfaction made by Christ upon the cross is not to be supplemented, substituted, nor repeated. The Scriptures are clear and comprehensive in announcing these truths. "Christ also hath once suffered for sins." "He died unto sin once." "So Christ was once offered to bear the sins of many." This great doctrine of the Protestants, of the Remonstrants, and of the Methodists, is set forth in the following nervous words, found in the Articles of Religion: "The offering of Christ, once made, is that perfect redemption, propitiation, and satisfaction for all the sins of the whole world, both original and actual; and there is none other satisfaction for sin but that alone. Wherefore the sacrifice of masses, in which it is commonly said that the priest doth offer Christ for the quick and the dead, to have remission of pain or guilt, is a blasphemous fable and dangerous deceit."

While the sacrifice is finished, and the atonement is complete, and the satisfaction is not to be supplemented nor substituted, and the oblation of Christ is not to be repeated, salvation was not consummated on the cross. Salvation—consisting in justification, regeneration, sanctification, and final glorification of soul and body in heaven—is another and different thing to the atonement, and does not inevitably follow upon a finished atonement, upon a complete satisfaction. The atonement made for the human race, complete and finished though it be—a supreme remedy for all the evils of sin though it is—is not salvation in actual pos-

session, already finished, already an accomplished fact, neither is this atonement an absolute guarantee of salvation. The atonement is a ground for salvation, and is a provision upon which salvation is tendered to sinners, but it may not eventuate in the salvation of those for whom it is a provision. The atonement exists in fact, and is complete, and existed finished and complete at least from the time of the crucifixion of the Son of God; but actual salvation has not even commenced in very many—many who now live, and those yet unborn. None are justified from eternity. The atonement was made without any conditions, and without consulting the desire and will of man; but salvation is offered upon conditions, and is made optional with those to whom it is offered, and its attainment is contingent. The atonement is efficacious, and the efficacy thereof is actually sufficient for the salvation of every human being, but it has not been effectual, and will not be, in the salvation of multitudes for whom it was made. Many for whom Jesus died will be eternally lost. The atonement was made for the race as such, and for the whole race, and for every individual of the race. Salvation, consummated, is attained by individuals. The atonement was made for the race of Adam, a complete provision for the race. Justification, regeneration, sanctification, and glorification in heaven, are not conferred upon the race, are not conferred upon a promiscuous mass, but upon the individual. That salvation is not an accomplished fact—an attainment already made, and already guaranteed—that those for whom Jesus died were not justified from eternity, is proved by the fact that Jesus, as an advocate with the Father, pleads for sins to be forgiven which have not been forgiven, and pleads for salvation to be conferred which has not been conferred.

In the progress of this discussion the question now to be considered is: For whom was the atonement made? The

atonement was made for the fallen race of Adam—for all this race. In the language of the Remonstrants: “Jesus Christ, by his death and sufferings, made an atonement for the sins of mankind in general, and for every individual in particular.” The atonement was made for this race, and for no other. No atonement has ever been made for the angels, neither for the good nor for the bad. The angels who have kept “their first estate” have not needed an atonement, and the blood of Christ could have no relation to them, and could not redeem them, even though they needed redemption. No atonement has been made for the fallen angels, and none could be made for them by Christ, for his blood could have no relation to them, inasmuch as Christ in his nature had nothing in common with theirs. He took not on him the nature of angels, nor the nature of devils, but he was made of a woman, and took on him the seed of Abraham, that he might redeem the human race from the curse of the law.

The following points are asserted and defended by the Calvinists: That God did, by his own decree, before the foundation of the world was laid, according to his eternal purpose, predestinate and elect to everlasting life, salvation, and glory a certain and definite number of men; and that these, the elect, Christ redeemed; and that all others are predestinated and foreordained to everlasting death, and these Christ did not redeem. The atonement was not made for the race, but for an elect company thereof. That all whom Christ redeemed will be actually saved. That the death of Christ on the cross did not, by and in itself, make atonement for sins, but that the acts of his life, conjointly with his passion, did. That Christ, in the acts of his life, obeyed the law for the elect; that this active obedience of Christ is a vicarious fulfillment of the law, and constitutes an essential element in the atonement, is as much as is his

suffering of the essence of the atonement, and that the elect are treated as if they had rendered that obedience themselves, being, in consideration of his active obedience, exempt from condemnation, and entitled to the reward of obedience; and that because his law has been perfectly and completely fulfilled for the redeemed by this obedience of Christ to the precepts thereof, God is absolutely bound to confer upon them the reward of eternal life.

The scheme of eternal, particular, and unconditional election is the basis upon which a limited atonement, an atonement passing to its final issue, and eventuating in salvation without conditions and without contingencies, is advocated. This scheme of election and reprobation is formulated and set out, and then the doctrine of atonement is formulated to fit it. The Calvinistic scheme is made symmetrical in itself, harmonious in all its parts, but it is under the fatal defect of being repugnant to Scripture and dissonant to truth. If fidelity to God is to guide, if the truth is to be vindicated, if the form of sound words and the system of sound doctrine are to be firmly maintained, then these points here named in this Calvinistic scheme must be rejected and refuted, for not one of them is consonant to the Scriptures.

Christ and the *counsels, decrees, foreördinations, elections, and reprobations*, which can be properly attributed to God in dealing with apostate man, cannot be dissevered. No election has been made of any individual, and no reprobation has been imposed upon any but in immediate connection with Christ; and no election is made of any individual, and no reprobation is imposed upon any except upon the conditions of the faith and obedience, the unbelief and disobedience, of the persons elected and reprobated; no election is made, and no reprobation is imposed except upon conditions involving contingencies. God has purposes and

plans, and his principles are immutable—never change—but he acts upon alternatives, and discriminates the morally good and bad, nevertheless.

Jesus Christ suffered death upon the cross for human redemption, and made then, by his oblation of himself once offered, a full, perfect, and sufficient sacrifice, oblation, and satisfaction for the sins of the whole human family. His obedience to the precepts of the law is no constituent element of the propitiation made on the cross. The obedience of Christ to the precepts of the law no more atoned for sins than did his immaculate birth. Would as well insist that those for whom he made atonement are not in need of regeneration, because Jesus was born immaculate, as to insist that they are free from the obligations of obedience to the divine law, because Christ obeyed the precepts thereof. Would as well say that his immaculate conception is vicarious, as that his active obedience is vicarious; would as well say that his immaculate conception is an element in the atonement as to say his active obedience is.

The "Westminster Confession of Faith" carefully and systematically sets forth the doctrine that Christ in his life and acts obeyed and fulfilled the law for the elect; that this active obedience is a distinct element in the atonement, and as essential thereto as his sufferings; that his active obedience was rendered for the elect, and is reckoned to their account, and they treated as though they had rendered the obedience themselves. This "Confession of Faith," from the beginning to the end, keeps this doctrine steadily in view, and is so worded throughout as to conform thereto. In proof of this doctrine this "Confession of Faith" gives the following texts from the Scripture: "Thus it cometh us to fulfill all righteousness" (Matt. iii. 15); "I am not come to destroy, but to fulfill" (Matt. v. 17); "So by the obedience of one shall many be made righteous" (Rom.

v. 19); "God sent forth his Son, made of a woman, made under the law" (Gal. iv. 4).

The Rev. George Smeaton, of Europe, in his work on "The Doctrine of the Atonement," follows exactly the "Westminster Confession of Faith," and advocates at great length this theory, and adduces in proof of the doctrine the same texts of Scripture. These texts he expounds to suit his theory:

That Christ's obedience to precepts and his death and sufferings are conjoined, in making atonement for sins, is not once hinted at in the Bible. There is not a word in the Scriptures which attributes salvation to Christ's obedience to law and precepts. The atonement is always predicated of his sufferings, his death, his blood. There is not a text which even suggests the idea that Christ obeyed the law for others, and the theory is destructive of moral obligation and of moral law, and is unreasonable.

But these texts adduced for proof by the "Westminster Confession of Faith," and by those who expound its doctrines, claim direct attention and demand a proper explanation.

"For thus it becometh us to fulfill all righteousness." (Matt. iii. 15.) The act of John is included in this fulfilling of righteousness as well as that of Christ. Was John's obedience an element in the atonement? Did John obey the law for the elect? Whatever else this text may teach, it does not teach that Christ obeyed the law and kept the precepts thereof for the elect, or for any one else. John was sent by God upon a mission peculiar to itself, and was intrusted with a special office and ministry. John, as a special messenger, and in his office a single and true witness, was to proclaim Christ, was to receive and recognize him, and was to manifest and make him known to Israel. For this he preached and baptized, and thus rightfully and

righteously exercised his ministry. In the baptism of Christ the ministry of John was honored, established, fulfilled, ended. Here John's ministry culminated and terminated. Here and now Christ's ministry commenced. Few, perhaps, have comprehended the sublime glory attained by John's ministry in the baptism of Christ. In this John inaugurated the ministry of Christ and terminated his own. His own glorious ministry faded into the sublimer ministry of Christ. The testimony of John's ministry to the Son of God culminated in the inaugural ceremonies of that baptism which inducted the Messiah into his ministry. The visible display of the Holy Ghost, and the audible voice of the Divine Father honored with the approbation of God and the glory of heaven the transaction, and sealed the whole with the signet of divine righteousness. Christ was baptized, but not in recognition of baptism as a sacrament, nor to make confession of sins, nor to give an example for others to follow, nor to fulfill the law in the place of others; neither was he baptized for initiation into the office of a priest after the order of the Levitical priesthood; for baptism was not then a sacrament, and he had no sins to confess, and he was not giving examples in the observance of ceremonies, and he was not releasing others from the obligations of ordinances by submitting thereto himself in their stead, and he never was a priest after the order of the Levitical priesthood; he was not of the tribe of Levi, but of the tribe of Judah, and John was not exercising the office of a priest, but he was in the wilderness far away from altars and priestly services, engaged in a special mission, exercising a special ministry, initiating a new order of things.

“Think not that I am come to destroy the law or the prophets; I am not come to destroy, but to fulfill.” (Matt. v. 17.) On this text the Rev. George Smeaton says: “In this fulfillment of the law and the prophets the Lord Jesus

must be considered as acting in the capacity of a surety, or substitute; and the obedience in both lights was, beyond doubt, vicarious. Hence his active obedience is for us, and reckoned to our account, not otherwise than if we had fulfilled it." ("The Doctrine of Atonement," Vol. I., p. 193.) On the same page of his book this author insists that the righteousness which Jesus says must "exceed the righteousness of the scribes and Pharisees," without which no entrance can be made into heaven, "is the surety righteousness, rather than that which is personal and inward." Such an interpretation of the Scriptures as this suggests darkness, blind guides, and devotion born of superstition. According to this Calvinistic dogma, and this Calvinistic interpretation of the word of God, there exists no necessity for personal obedience to the law of God, and none for personal inward holiness. All such dogmas and all such interpretations might be consigned to oblivion without any detriment to human interests, and without detracting aught from the divine glory. It was no part of Christ's mission to release men from obedience to law, or from the obligation of inward holiness. His mission and work contemplated and purposed just the opposite.

By the law, in the text now under consideration, Christ means the moral law, and by the prophets he means the word and commandments of God contained in the writings of the prophets. Christ may have fulfilled the ceremonial law of Moses in some way, but he did not perform the acts required by it in the place of others. Christ led a sinless life, a life in harmony with the requirements of his own law, but that had nothing to do with obeying moral law to release others from the obligation of obeying Christ—did not antagonize the law and the prophets. The moral law he never corrected, modified, abrogated, or annulled. He neither subtracted from nor added to this law. He did not

fill out and expand it. He never altered or changed it in the least jot or tittle. The moral law, which is a transcript of his own eternal mind, and as immutable as truth, Jesus recognized, expounded, vindicated, and enforced. But this was not doing for others what the law commands them to do themselves.

“By the obedience of one shall many be made righteous.” (Rom. v. 19.) The apostle was contrasting Adam and Christ. He was showing what men had been made through Adam, and what they might be made through Christ; what men had been made through the disobedience of Adam, and what they might be made through the obedience of Christ. The provision made by Christ for the attainment of righteousness is set over against the corrupting and condemning offense of Adam. There is not the slightest allusion here to Christ’s obeying the precepts of the law in the place and stead of others. But the real meaning and proper explanation of the phrase, “the obedience of one,” is found in another passage of Paul’s writings: “And being found in fashion as a man, he humbled himself, and became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross.” (Phil. ii. 8.) This is the obedience by which many shall be made righteous. Jesus voluntarily submitted to death, to the death of the cross; and by this obedience, by this voluntary death, salvation is offered to men in the attainment of righteousness.

“God sent forth his Son, made of a woman, made under the law.” (Gal. iv. 4.) This text teaches that Christ took man’s nature by a miraculous conception in the womb of the Virgin Mary, and that in assuming this human nature he came under the law, its obligations and penalties, that thus related to human nature he might, by his death, redeem those under the condemnation of the law, and exalt them to sonship with God, and to heirship in his kingdom. This, and nothing more. There is not one thing in the

text to even suggest the idea of Christ's obedience to precepts to release any one from the duty of obeying the commandments of God.

In the nature of the case it was impossible for Christ to obey, by a special personal act, every precept of the law. There are precepts which bear on certain relations in human society. There are some positions in human society which Jesus never filled. Therefore, to the precepts incident to these positions in society Christ never performed an act of obedience. He was never husband, wife, father, mother, sister, nor civil ruler. The precepts imposing obligations and duties in these relations and positions he could not fulfill by any personal act. This active righteousness is therefore, in its own nature, insufficient—it is insufficient for the purposes for which its advocates have brought it forward. As a scheme of doctrine it is too Utopian to need refutation. It was fabricated to make out the theory of particular and unconditional election. It harmonizes with that theory, nothing more.

By many and various presentations of the subject the Scriptures teach that man cannot redeem himself, cannot make atonement for his sins. With equal clearness and comprehensiveness they teach that Christ has redeemed man, has made atonement for his sins. With the same emphasis they teach that under the provisions of this atonement God requires men, in their own persons and for themselves, to obey the precepts of his law. This is a demonstration that Christ's obedience to precepts was not a constituent element in the atonement, and is not substituted for the personal obedience of those for whom the atonement was made. Through the gospel God makes to men an offer of salvation upon conditions. The result of the offer made to men is contingent. This is a complete refutation of the whole Calvinistic theory of Christ's active righteousness, and of

unconditional and eternal personal election and reprobation. A few passages from the Bible on these points may suffice to establish the truth. *Conditions* and *contingency* are used here for two reasons: First, they are the very words to express the truth involved; and second, they are used by the "Westminster Confession of Faith," and so Calvinists cannot object to their use in this discussion.

"Ye shall diligently keep the commandments of the Lord your God, and his testimonies, and his statutes which he hath commanded thee. And thou shalt do that which is right and good in the sight of the Lord." (Deut. vi. 17, 18.) "Thou hast commanded us to keep thy precepts diligently." (Ps. cxix. 4.) "Whosoever therefore shall break one of these least commandments, and shall teach men so, he shall be called the least in the kingdom of heaven; but whosoever shall do and teach them, the same shall be called great in the kingdom of heaven." (Matt. v. 19.) "So likewise ye, when ye shall have done all those things which are commanded you, say, We are unprofitable servants; we have done that which was our duty to do." (Luke xvii. 10.) "He that saith, I know him, and keepeth not his commandments, is a liar, and the truth is not in him." (1 John ii. 4.)

These passages—and an indefinite number could be given—teach that God requires men, in their own persons and for themselves, to obey the precepts of his law, and that they are not in any way released from obedience to the commandments called moral. The law of God is, under the provisions of the atonement, a rule of conduct for men, and Christ did not obey its precepts to furnish a substitute in obedience which should be reckoned to men's account; and he did not in any wise abolish the divine law as a rule of human action. He said: "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy

mind. This is the first and great commandment. And the second is like unto it, Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself." (Matt. xxii. 37-39.) In his final commission to his apostles, before his ascension, are found these words: "Teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you." (Matt. xxviii. 20.)

"Not every one that saith unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven; but he that doeth the will of my Father which is in heaven." (Matt. vii. 21.) "If thou wilt enter into life, keep the commandments." (Matt. xix. 17.) "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned." (Mark xvi. 16.) "Except ye repent, ye shall all likewise perish." (Luke xiii. 3.) "For if ye believe not that I am he, ye shall die in your sins." (John viii. 24.) "He that rejecteth me, and receiveth not my words, hath one that judgeth him: the word that I have spoken, the same shall judge him in the last day." (John xii. 48.) "For if ye live after the flesh, ye shall die; but if ye through the Spirit do mortify the deeds of the body, ye shall live." (Rom. viii. 13.) "Wherefore, the rather, brethren, give diligence to make your calling and election sure; for if ye do these things, ye shall never fall; for so an entrance shall be ministered unto you abundantly into the everlasting kingdom of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ." (2 Pet. i. 10, 11.) "Blessed are they that do his commandments, that they may have right to the tree of life, and may enter in through the gates into the city." (Rev. xxii. 14.)

These passages—and many others equally conclusive could be adduced—teach that God makes, through the atonement of Jesus Christ, an offer of salvation to men upon conditions, and that the result of the offer made is contingent. Each man will attain to everlasting salvation or everlasting punishment, according to the nature and merit of

his own actions. Those who are finally saved might have been lost, and those who are finally lost might have been saved. Those for whom Christ died may finally perish. These passages, here given from the Bible, cannot be interpreted upon any other hypothesis; and these passages show that the Calvinistic theory—which teaches that certain persons were predestinated from eternity to everlasting life and glory, without any reference to faith or good works in them as conditions of their final salvation, and that other men were predestinated from eternity to everlasting damnation, without any reference to unbelief and evil works in them as cause for their final damnation—has the infelicity of contradicting the plain teachings of the Bible. The atonement has been made that holiness and eternal life may be given to men. Holiness and heaven are offered in a way to vindicate moral law and perpetuate divine authority, and hence the offer is made upon conditions, and involves contingencies. If God could deal with fallen man upon the basis of fate, and could bestow his grace arbitrarily, he could have dispensed with the atonement altogether.

The doctrine of absolute salvation without conditions and contingencies, built upon the predestinating decree of God limiting the atonement to a definite number of individuals, and built upon the active righteousness of Christ, heretofore defined, is without any warrant of Scripture. The atonement made by Christ upon the cross for sin is a provision which offers salvation to all men upon conditions, and the issue is dependent upon the personal acceptance and rejection of the offer. Some individuals accept it, and are saved; some reject it, and are lost. All men—those under the imperfections of infancy, idiocy, and lunacy excepted—are able to embrace and accept the grace of God, and all who are able to accept are able to reject it when offered. The atonement, as a provision for salvation, gra-

ciously confers ability. Man is wholly disabled in his will by sin, and by his own nature and by his own strength he cannot turn to God, and cannot do any good works, but by the prevenient grace supplied by the atonement of Christ he has ability to accept or reject, as he may choose, the atoning work of the Son of God. The atonement eventuates in salvation in every case, when the individual does not reject and disobey the gospel, and in damnation in every case where the individual persistently rejects and disobeys the gospel to the end of his probation. There is nothing which limits the atonement in its actual results but the voluntary acceptance or rejection of it by men. It is admitted that all men will not be actually saved, but the responsibility is with the individual who is lost, and his damnation is because of his sin, and not because he was arbitrarily excluded from the provisions of the atonement. The final results, in which men are actually and forever lost, do not indicate that the atonement is limited, and is for only a part of the race. The atonement is universal in its provision and in its sufficiency. The atonement made by the death and passion of Jesus Christ upon the cross was made for the human race in general, and for every individual in particular. In this atonement for sins there is neither deficiency of merit nor excess of value. It is intrinsically, potentially, and actually sufficient for the salvation of all men, and its sufficiency is not to be limited by the actual extent to which its benefits are received, and it is not to be concluded that there is any waste of its virtue because men for whom it was made are lost. There is in the atonement grace enough for all, but it is not appropriated in actual salvation. This does not, however, involve excess and waste. The application of this grace, flowing out of the atonement in actual salvation, does not exhaust it, and the non-application of it does not increase its volume nor en-

hance its virtue. Therefore, it does not follow, because those for whom Christ died perish finally in their sins, that there is a residue of atoning merit left to waste.

This glorious scheme of satisfaction and salvation maintains all the principles involved in the divine law, perpetuates the divine authority, and properly displays the harmonious perfections of the Divine Being. It brings men, in the exercise of moral endowments and in the attainment of pure hearts and holy lives, into fellowship with God.

It is highly befitting that, in singleness of heart, for the utterance of the truth, and for the purpose of making known all things as they are in Christ Jesus, this subject of the limit and extent of the atonement should now be submitted directly to the word of God. The Scriptures completely and triumphantly vindicate the position that Jesus, upon the cross, made atonement for all the sins of all men, and that through this atonement a *bona fide* offer of salvation is made alike to all persons, wherever the gospel is preached, on conditions of faith in its merits, and obedience to its righteous principles and divine ordinances.

“Behold the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world.” (John i. 29.) No device of criticism can limit the meaning of this text to a few men. Here is a sacrifice, an expiation, an atonement in Christ as extensive as sin, and inclusive of the sin of the whole human race.

“For God so loved the world, that he gave his only-begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life.” (John iii. 16.) Would it not be a most singular performance to attempt to prove from this text that God’s love extends to only a select and limited number of men? The text does not name a contracted love, but a comprehensive and all-embracing love. God so loved the world—the whole human race—that he gave his Son a propitiation for the sins thereof. In the re-

ception of this propitiation by faith any and every man may escape the corruption and condemnation which are in the world, and may obtain eternal life; and any and every man may despise and reject this propitiation and perish eternally.

“For when we were yet without strength, in due time Christ died for the ungodly.” (Rom. v. 6.) Who are the ungodly? Are not all men ungodly? *Christ died for the ungodly*; all men are ungodly; therefore he died for all men.

“For the love of Christ constraineth us; because we thus judge, that if one died for all, then were all dead; and that he died for all, that they which live should not henceforth live unto themselves, but unto him which died for them and rose again.” (2 Cor. v. 14, 15.) This text is so emphatic, conclusive, and complete, as authority for an atonement as extensive as the human race, that the quibbles resorted to by the Calvinists to explain it away are confirmatory of this authority. It is said by Calvinists that the word *all* is as often used in Scripture in a restricted sense as it is in a general sense. It is as evident that the word *all* is not used in a limited or restricted sense in this text as that it is ever used in such sense anywhere else. If it should be asserted that this word is used in this text in this restrained sense, then the assertion that it is always used in this restrained sense will be in order.

“For there is one God, and one Mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus; who gave himself a ransom for all, to be testified in due time.” (1 Tim. ii. 5, 6.) The unity of the human race, the undivided authority of God, the solcness and universality of the mediation of Jesus Christ, are beautifully and strongly portrayed in this text. Christ gave himself—his life—a price, a satisfaction, a ransom for all men, for each and every man.

“But we see Jesus, who was made a little lower than the

angels for the suffering of death, crowned with glory and honor; that he by the grace of God should taste death for every man." (Hebrews ii. 9.) Jesus was humbled lower than the angels by taking human nature and suffering death, after which he was exalted to the right-hand of God the Father, and crowned with glory and honor. He tasted, suffered death, died to atone for the sins of every man of every nation and of every generation. He offered himself "once for all." This is to be duly testified, and testified in all seasons, in all times, and in all places.

"And he is the propitiation for our sins; and not for ours only, but also for the sins of the whole world." (1 John ii. 2.) John is very specific in stating the doctrine of the universality of the atoning work of the Son of God. There are none so good and none so bad as to be outside of the provisions of redemption. He states that Jesus is the propitiation for the sins of the Christians and for the sins of the men in the world not Christians. There is no restricted meaning in this statement of the case. "And we have seen and do testify that the Father sent the Son to be the Saviour of the world." (1 John iv. 14.)

Melody and joy are in the voice of the Son of God as it is heard in the proclamation of that salvation which is to be to all people. Acclamations of praise swell out upon the ear of God as the day breaks, the shadows flee away, and streams of divine light are poured forth upon the majestic mountains, and radiate among the everlasting hills. The wail of woe, the lamentation of unending grief, and the piercing cry born of a wretched doom, will also be heard in the day when Christ shall come forth to take vengeance on those who know not God and obey not the gospel.

That an offer of salvation is made to men wherever the gospel is preached upon conditions of faith in the merits of the atonement and obedience to its righteous principles, is

attested by the Scriptures. That the gospel is to be preached to all nations is also settled beyond any doubt by inspired utterance. The results to follow the offer of salvation are contingent. The men to whom the gospel is preached may accept the offer made them and be saved, and the same men may reject it and be lost.

In the solution of the question herein involved, and the establishment of the doctrines herein asserted, the Scriptures, and not rudely heaped conjectures, are relied on, and appeal is made to the following texts:

“See, I have set before thee this day life and good, and death and evil; in that I command thee this day to love the Lord thy God, to walk in his ways, and to keep his commandments, and his statutes, and his judgments, that thou mayest live and multiply; and the Lord thy God shall bless thee in the land whither thou goest to possess it. But if thy heart turn away, so that thou wilt not hear, but shalt be drawn away, and worship other gods, and serve them; I denounce unto you this day that ye shall surely perish, and that ye shall not prolong your days upon the land, whither thou passest over Jordan to go to possess it. I call heaven and earth to record this day against you, that I have set before you life and death, blessing and cursing; therefore choose life, that both thou and thy seed may live.” (Deut. xxx. 15–19.)

“Because I have called, and ye refused; I have stretched out my hand, and no man regarded; but ye have set at naught all my counsel, and would none of my reproof; I also will laugh at your calamity; I will mock when your fear cometh.” (Prov. i. 24–26.)

“Look unto me, and be ye saved, all the ends of the earth; for I am God, and there is none else.” (Isa. xlv. 22.)

“Have I any pleasure at all that the wicked should die?

saith the Lord God; and not that he should return from his ways and live? . . . For I have no pleasure in the death of him that dieth, saith the Lord God; wherefore turn yourselves, and live ye. . . . Say unto them, As I live, saith the Lord God, I have no pleasure in the death of the wicked; but that the wicked turn from his way and live; turn ye, turn ye from your evil ways; for why will ye die, O house of Israel?" (Ezek. xviii. 23, 32; xxxiii. 11.)

"And he said unto them, Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned." (Mark xvi. 15, 16.)

"And ye will not come to me, that ye might have life. . . . I am come that they might have life, and that they might have it more abundantly. . . . But these are written, that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God; and that believing ye might have life through his name." (John v. 40; x. 10; xx. 31.)

"For the grace of God that bringeth salvation hath appeared to all men." (Titus ii. 11.)

"The Lord is not slack concerning his promise, as some men count slackness; but is long-suffering to us-ward, not willing that any should perish, but that all should come to repentance." (2 Pet. iii. 9.)

"And the Spirit and the bride say, Come. And let him that heareth say, Come. And let him that is athirst come. And whosoever will, let him take the water of life freely." (Rev. xxii. 17.)

Good and evil, life and death, are set before men. Life and death, in antithesis, are made to men things between which to choose. In the exercise of the power with which they are endowed by the grace of God through Jesus Christ, men can choose either the one or the other. They can refuse the life tendered them, and perish in the destruction

of their own evil ways. They can, in the exercise of their own liberty, indulge unbelief, reject the statutes, and violate the commandments of God, scorn the overtures of mercy, grieve away the Holy Spirit, forfeit forever life and happiness, and plunge into the whirlpool of an endless calamity. God desires to give all men life, and offers it to them. Many of them will not have life. God would save them, and they will not be saved. In this self-destruction, sought and obtained by men, God is disappointed and grieved. "Why will ye die?" is God's question. And this question shows that God is disappointed, and that the result he intended is not secured. So long as it is written, "I have called and ye refused," "How often would I have gathered thy children together, even as a hen gathereth her chickens under her wings, and ye would not!" it is useless to deny the liberty of human actions, the contingency of men's final estate, and that some men are lost whom God desired to save, and would have saved had not their unbelief and rebellion prevented.

The passages of the Scriptures which name certain classes as interested in Christ's saving grace are relied on by the Calvinists to support the doctrine of a limited atonement. Such as the following:

"And she shall bring forth a son, and thou shalt call his name JESUS; for he shall save his people from their sins." (Matt. i. 21.)

"And I lay down my life for the sheep." (John x. 15.)

"He prophesied that Jesus should die for that nation; and not for that nation only, but that also he should gather together in one the children of God that were scattered abroad. . . . Greater love hath no man than this, that a man lay down his life for his friends." (John xi. 51, 52; xv. 13.)

"The Church of God, which he hath purchased with his own blood." (Acts xx. 28.)

“For the husband is the head of the wife, even as Christ is the head of the Church; and he is the Saviour of the body. . . . Husbands, love your wives, even as Christ also loved the Church, and gave himself for it.” (Eph. v. 23, 25.)

That Jesus laid down his life for his sheep and for his friends, that he died for his people and for the children of God, that he gave himself for the Church of God, and purchased it with his own blood, will not be denied here. The atonement was made for these, but this does not exclude others from its provision. A declaration that one class of individuals has been redeemed is no evidence that other classes have not. The declaration that Enoch walked with God will not justify the conclusion that he was the only man in his time who walked with God. The sacrifice is finished, the atonement is complete, and the whole race has been redeemed.

“Thine, O Lord, is the greatness, and the power, and the glory, and the victory, and the majesty; for all that is in the heaven and in the earth is thine; thine is the kingdom, O Lord, and thou art exalted as head above all. Both riches and honor come of thee, and thou reignest over all; and in thy hand is power and might; and in thy hand it is to make great, and to give strength unto all.” (1 Chron. xxix. 11, 12.) “Having therefore, brethren, boldness to enter into the holiest by the blood of Jesus, by a new and living way, which he hath consecrated for us, through the veil, that is to say, his flesh; and having a high-priest over the house of God; let us draw near with a true heart in full assurance of faith, having our hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience, and our bodies washed with pure water.” (Heb. x. 19-22.)

CHAPTER XII.

JUSTIFICATION.

THE atonement is finished, and as a provision for salvation is sufficient for the purposes for which it has been instituted, but in its bestowals has not passed to its final issue. Actual salvation is reached by a prescribed and undeviating process. In the economy of recovering grace, justification, regeneration, sanctification, resurrection, and glorification, are direct attainments in the prescribed process. Justification appertains to jurisprudence, and stands connected with judicial sentence. Law is founded in the divine perfections. Jurisdiction is given for the justification of the righteous. The due administration of law is itself justification. Thereby truth and justice are maintained, the good and pure are vindicated, and the vicious and vile are condemned. In legal requisitions a righteous administration justifies the innocent.

But a definition of justification as given in the Scriptures must be submitted. Where there is innocence there is no condemnation. Those moral creatures who have never sinned, but have ever been obedient to law, are justified by their perfect obedience, without atonement, and without conditions. Justification, in such cases, is a sentence given upon the intrinsic merits of the creatures justified. The Bible speaks of a sentence of justification to be passed in the general judgment at the end of time. This justification will be an exhibition and commendation of the works and graces of those receiving the sentence, and an acceptance of such persons.

Justification, the definition of which is now submitted, is an act of God absolving the sinner from guilt and condemnation. It is the forgiveness of sins, the remission of sins, the pardon of sins. It is an act of God accounting the sinner as righteous. This justification changes the relation of the sinner to God, and restores him to the divine approbation. Justification is neither progressive nor partial; it is instantaneous, and complete at once. By one act of God all the past sins of the sinner, to whom the pardon is granted, are blotted out.

In support of the definition of justification here given, and of the character of the work here described, the following texts are adduced: "Be it known unto you, therefore, men and brethren, that through this man is preached unto you the forgiveness of sins; and by him all that believe are justified from all things, from which ye could not be justified by the law of Moses" (Acts xiii. 38, 39); "Blessed are they whose iniquities are forgiven, and whose sins are covered. Blessed is the man to whom the Lord will not impute sin" (Rom. iv. 7, 8).

God is the Lawgiver, Judge, and King of the Universe. It is a well-defined scriptural truth, that none "can forgive sins but God only." He who claims authority to forgive sins invades the prerogatives of the Almighty. He who claims authority to grant indulgences to men, and give them license to sin, assumes to do more than Jehovah himself proposes to do. Such assumptions antagonize all truth, involve all iniquity, and merit endless perdition. The apostle's admonition is very forcible, and his description is very explicit: "Let no man deceive you by any means; for that day shall not come, except there come a falling away first, and that man of sin be revealed, the son of perdition; who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that is worshiped; so that he as God sitteth in the

temple of God, showing himself that he is God." (2 Thess. ii. 3, 4.)

God organized the Church, and set over it teachers and rulers; he gave to it apostles, prophets, evangelists, pastors, and teachers. He sets apart bishops and pastors to govern and take care of the Church. These are clothed with authority to censure and excommunicate offenders, to clear and protect the good. They are given for the work of the ministry, for the perfecting of the saints, for the edification of the whole body of believers. Law is administered for the peace and purity of the Church. Upon the due administration of law the usefulness of the Church—yea, her very existence—depends. But the claim in ecclesiastical ranks to the vicegerency of the Lord Almighty is as false as it is presumptuous. The authority and power to forgive sins reside in and abide with God alone, and these he has never conferred on nor transferred to any one else. As ubiquity and omniscience belong to God only, so he alone can so take cognizance of the secrets, purposes, penitence, and faith of men in different parts of the earth as to know when they are entitled, under the provisions of justifying grace, to a judgment of acquittal from guilt. The forgiveness of sins does not depend upon priestly manipulations, as it does not come through the channel of the priesthood, but directly from God himself.

Jesus Christ has been set forth a propitiation for the remission of sins, and this propitiation is the ground, or cause, of the justification of the ungodly who accept the same by faith. For the alone merit of Jesus Christ God accounts men righteous, or forgives their sins. All men are guilty before God, and are corrupt in themselves, and, consequently, have no merit of their own, and can offer no satisfaction for their guilt. Nothing that they can do will avail for the forgiveness of sins. There is no name, and

there is no merit, through which forgiveness can be obtained than the name and merit of Jesus. The merit of Christ's death is complete in itself. Theorists may parade human facilities, and magnify human inventions, but no scriptural method can ignore the atoning merits of Christ as the cause of justification. The blood of Christ was shed for the remission of sins. There are methods of application and of administration in the work of salvation; this is constantly asserted in these pages. Conditions are instituted upon which the atonement of Christ is to be applied to each individual case, and without conformity to these conditions, and without the application of this specific provision to the individual case, there can be ultimately no salvation; yet the atonement was completed by the death of Christ, and is the sole cause of justification. As Jesus is to deliver from the wrath to come, so he delivers from guilt; through him the grace of justification is conferred. In various forms of expression, and in many places of his writings, the apostle Paul teaches that the forgiveness of sins is vouchsafed by God through the blood and for the sake of Jesus Christ.

What the forgiveness of sins has been in one generation it has been in all generations. It was the same in the days preceding the advent of Christ that it has been in the days succeeding said advent. In the times of Abel, Enoch, and Noah, Abraham, David, and Malachi, and Peter, Paul, and Polycarp, sins have been forgiven for the same cause and on the same condition. Those of patriarchal times had as intimate a relation to Christ, and as vital faith, and as comprehensive and satisfactory assurance of their justification, as those of apostolic and succeeding times. Grace and spiritual discernment, as well as law and carnal ordinances, existed under the Mosaic economy. To every individual justified, in whatever age of the world he has lived, a full

pardon has been granted—all his past sins have been blotted out.

Justification effects a change of relation. It inaugurates a state of reconciliation with God and the individual justified. The justified individual stands accepted of God, and free from liability to the retributions of offended justice, and that so long as a justified state is retained. Justification simply changes the relation, and not the nature, of the individual. While a change of relation and a change of nature are by no means the same—justification and regeneration being in no sense the same work—yet whoever has this change of relation has also a change of nature; whoever has been justified has been also regenerated. These two, justification and regeneration, always accompany each other. They are no more to be confounded than are the resurrection and glorification, and are no more to be separated than are love and obedience.

The condition upon which justification is granted demands careful consideration. This condition is uniform. All individuals of every generation and of every nation, who are amenable to requisition, attain justification upon the same condition. There is not one condition for one man and one generation, and another condition for another man and another generation. Infants dying in infancy, and idiots living to adult years, are justified and saved without condition. For the simple reason that they are physically and mentally incapable of doing any thing to assist or hinder their salvation, they are not required to repent, nor believe, nor work righteousness. They can neither accept nor reject the condition. In such cases God applies the atoning merit and cleansing blood of Christ in justifying, regenerating, sanctifying, and saving, without condition. They—infants dying in infancy, and idiots living to adult years—are entitled to the saving benefits of the atonement,

as that atonement is a general provision for all sinners; and they are entitled to those saving benefits because they do not and cannot offer any bar to their bestowal by a responsible rejection thereof. Notwithstanding these exceptions here stated, justification, regeneration, adoption, and sanctification, are in the case of infants and idiots the same that they are in the case of intelligent adults. The number of sins to be pardoned in any given case does not change the nature of justification, and does not change the nature of regeneration. These—justification and regeneration—are exactly the same in the case of an adult who in a long career has committed numerous sins as they are in the case of an adult whose career has been short and whose sins have been few.

The Calvinists, advocating their theory of immutable decrees, of personal unconditional election and reprobation from eternity, and of a limited atonement, teach that Christ's righteousness is imputed to the elect for their justification. This whole theory of the imputation of Christ's righteousness, whether emphasizing what is called his active or what is called his passive obedience, is antagonistic to every true idea of the nature of the forgiveness of sins. Christ's atoning death is the cause for, not the condition of, justification. Existing absolutely, it cannot be the condition of the bestowal of any bounty and blessing, but only the cause for such bestowal. The atoning death of Christ cannot be substituted for the forfeited innocence of the individual. Christ's active obedience, in the sense that he obeyed the precepts of the law for others, as has been shown in preceding pages, is a fiction without any warrant of Scripture. The doctrine that Christ obeyed the precepts of the divine law for others, and that this obedience is imputed to those for whom it was rendered, can never accord with the true idea of the forgiveness of sins. Those

for whom Christ obeyed the law—were there such—would not need forgiveness of sins, as in such case the obedience which themselves should have rendered would simply be substituted by the obedience of Christ. This would be substitution, not remission. Again, if election and reprobation are unconditional, then there can be no condition in the forgiveness of sins; and, indeed, the Calvinistic “Confession of Faith” is conformed throughout to this view of the case. This Calvinistic doctrine of Christ’s imputed righteousness for justification must go down as a part of the unscriptural theory of unconditional election and reprobation. Nevertheless, there is a real purpose and there is a true merit pertaining to Christ’s death; and this purpose may with profit be kept prominently in view, and this merit may very properly be constantly magnified.

No true theory of justification can ignore the loving-kindness, mercy, and grace of God. No true theory can ignore the atoning merit of Christ, the Son of God, nor the divine assistance of the Holy Ghost. That Christ, who was himself without sin, made an offering for sin, and that through this offering reconciliation to God has been provided for, and proposed on stipulated condition, the Bible most surely establishes. That God will, for the sake of the atoning merit of Christ, forgive sins no one who believes the Bible can for a moment doubt. The divinity and the righteousness of Christ are equally essential in the scheme of redemption. That Christ was “holy, harmless, undefiled, separate from sinners,” is a fact essential to the work for which he came out from the Father. Eternal redemption comes alone through the atoning merit of Jesus Christ, the Son of God. Whoever is forgiven his sins is forgiven not for his own righteousness, nor for his own works, but alone for the sake of what Christ has suffered for him.

Every plea must be renounced but the plea that Christ hath died, and every price must be discounted as worthless but the price of Christ's precious blood. This Calvinistic theory of Christ's imputed righteousness encourages a presumptuous and profligate career in sin, is boasted of and depended on as an excuse for continuing in a course of transgression, and in very many ways it is made to pervert the Scriptures and dishonor the Son of God. As it is adverse to the truth, and tends to the increase of ungodliness, it should be speedily passed over to oblivion.

Alexander Campbell teaches that the forgiveness of sins is obtained by immersion, and that immersion is so indispensable that there is no remission without it. In his book, "The Christian System," he has a chapter on "Remission of Sins." In this chapter he uses many different terms as identical which are not identical, and confounds many things which are quite distinct in themselves. He speaks of a change of state, a change of nature, conversion, justification, regeneration, faith, obedience, and immersion, as one and the same. (See pages 194-197.) But through all this confounding of terms and confusing of things he never fails to declare that immersion is ordained and administered for the forgiveness of sins, and that there is no remission without it. The following quotations may suffice to show the position of this author on this subject:

"The apostle Peter, when first publishing the gospel to the Jews, taught them that they were not forgiven their sins by faith, but by an act of faith, by a believing immersion into the Lord Jesus." (Page 194.)

"Immersion for the forgiveness of sins was *the command* addressed to these believers, to these penitents, in answer to the most earnest question, and by one of the most sincere, candid, and honest speakers ever heard. This act of faith was presented as that act by which a change in their state

could be effected; or, in other words, by which alone they could be pardoned." (Page 195.)

"Thus the apostles, in passing through the country, gave great joy to the disciples from among the Jews, 'telling them of the conversion,' or immersion, of the Gentiles. Indeed, in a short time it was a summary way of representing the faith, reformation, and immersion of disciples, by using one word for all." (Page 196.)

"All these testimonies concur with each other in presenting the act of faith—Christian immersion, frequently called *conversion*—as that act, inseparably connected with the remission of sins; or that change of state of which we have already spoken." (Page 197.)

"Remission of sins, or coming into a state of acceptance, being one of the present immunities of the kingdom of heaven, cannot be scripturally enjoyed by any person before immersion." (Page 208.)

"To resume the direct testimonies declarative of the remission of sins by immersion, we turn to the Gentiles." (Page 210.)

"I come now to another of the direct and positive testimonies of the apostles, showing that immersion for the remission of sins is an institution of Jesus Christ." (Page 214.)

"In Luke's acceptance and time forgiveness of sins stood for immersion." (Page 235.)

This scheme of Mr. Campbell subverts the Christian system, and consequently has nothing to support it but the cunning craftiness of those who lie in wait to deceive. In all the word of God immersion is not once named as a Christian work, and is not once commanded as a Christian duty. Immersion is no more an institution of the gospel than is drowning. Mr. Campbell says: "Neither praying, singing, reading, repenting, sorrowing, resolving, nor waiting to be better, was the converting act." (Page 209.) It

is true that praying, singing, reading, repenting, sorrowing, resolving, and waiting to be better, are none of them made the condition of justification, but it is a singular perverseness on the part of Mr. Campbell to deny repentance a place in the process of attaining religion, and to deny to the sinner the prerogative to pray for divine clemency, and then make immersion the *sine qua non* of justification and salvation. The Bible makes repentance the duty and prayer the privilege of a sinner, but immersion involves no duty and confers no prerogative. Even baptism, which is a Christian ordinance, is not made the condition of justification. Baptism is no more the condition of justification than is prayer.

No doubt baptism has been administered to many persons who have never received any pardon of sins, and in whom no change of heart or nature has ever been wrought. In some cases sins have been forgiven and the Holy Ghost has been conferred where baptism has not been submitted to, and this shows that baptism is not the divinely ordained condition of justification, and that it is not indispensable to salvation. The malefactor who was crucified at the time Christ was crucified, and who "said unto Jesus, Lord, remember me when thou comest into thy kingdom," was pardoned while on the cross, and promised admittance into paradise. This was all without baptism, and demonstrates that remission of sins can be attained and enjoyed by persons before and without immersion, and even without baptism. Peter preached the gospel, as revealed by the word of God, at the house of Cornelius, and "the Holy Ghost fell on all them which heard the word," and they "received the Holy Ghost" before they were baptized with water. (See Acts x. 44-48.) This gives a conspicuous view of the subject, and demonstrates that baptism is not necessary to forgiveness of sins.

Not by circumcision, nor by baptism, nor by any other ceremony or ordinance, nor by any works of obedience to law whatsoever, can pardon be obtained, but by faith alone in Jesus Christ. This the apostle, in the Epistle to the Romans, argues exhaustively and establishes conclusively: "Therefore by the deeds of the law there shall no flesh be justified in his sight; for by the law is the knowledge of sin. But now the righteousness of God without the law is manifested, being witnessed by the law and the prophets; even the righteousness of God, which is by faith of Jesus Christ unto all, and upon all them that believe; for there is no difference; for all have sinned, and come short of the glory of God; being justified freely by his grace, through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus, whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation through faith in his blood, to declare his righteousness for the remission of sins that are past, through the forbearance of God; to declare, I say, at this time his righteousness; that he might be just, and the justifier of him which believeth in Jesus. Where is boasting, then? It is excluded. By what law? of works? Nay; but by the law of faith. Therefore we conclude that a man is justified by faith without the deeds of the law." (Rom. iii. 20-28.)

Forgiveness of sins is granted on the condition of faith only. Repentance, though it is appointed for specified ends, though it is sorrow leading to conversion of mind, and though it must precede the faith of a sinner, is never named in the Scriptures as the condition upon which pardon is granted. Though it is necessary in bringing the sinner into accord with the state which he seeks and the law which he has broken; though the knowledge and recognition of the guilt and danger under which the sinner lies are essential in the process of salvation; though the sinner must have an awful sense of impending justice ready to break in

vengeance on his devoted head, and must abhor and hate his sin, before he can be justified, yet repentance is no part of the condition of justification. No man can have saving faith without previously repenting of his sins, but he may be enlightened and convicted, may repent, confess, and pray, and yet not obtain forgiveness of sins. Repentance may not eventuate in justification, whereas if the sinner has faith he has also forgiveness of sins; faith eventuates in pardon. Faith brings the blessings God designs to give. Repentance, humiliation, and confession conduct the sinner along the way to faith; these conduct the sinner to that trust and assurance which bring the blessedness of pardoned sin. There is a special grant of pardon to the individual sinner whenever he believes, and not before. Repentance is no more the condition of justification than is conviction, or grace. In the same measure that value attaches to repentance does it become important that its nature and functions be properly defined. In formulating a theory of doctrine repentance should be correctly adjusted to other essentials, and assigned its proper place. In the divine scheme of recovery from sin repentance is given great prominence. From the time of the first generations of men, and on through all the ages, God has called on transgressors to repent. John, preaching in the wilderness, and Jesus, teaching through all Palestine, gave special emphasis to the doctrine of repentance. "Repent ye," was the language of John; and Jesus said: "Except ye repent, ye shall all likewise perish." The poet has embodied the divine truth in the following stanza:

"Repent!" the voice celestial cries;
"No longer dare delay;
The wretch that scorns the mandate dies,
And meets a fiery day."

The sinner that would obtain the grace of God, and that

would be saved in heaven, must repent—must repent of the sins he has committed as well as the evil nature he inherited from a fallen progenitor. In repentance there is contrition of spirit, sorrow for offenses, denunciation and renunciation of sin. After all the prominence and importance given to repentance, there is nothing in the word of God which authorizes the conclusion that it is the condition of justification. Repentance is never “counted for righteousness;” but then it is asserted that faith is.

The Jews, in apostolic times, adduced many false interpretations of law, and defended many heretical doctrines. To their hereditary relations they attached undue importance, and to circumcision, and to the rites and ceremonies incident to the Mosaic economy, they attributed virtue which never pertained thereto. By virtue of their ritualistic ceremonies and ecclesiastical manipulations, these Jews claimed a righteousness and divine heirship all their own. As a result of their heresies they went into many pernicious practices. They boasted of the law in its ceremonies while they broke it in its principles and moral precepts. Paul the apostle, in his Epistles, condemned and refuted their vile heresies and rebuked their sacrilegious practices. He showed conclusively that priestly rites and ritualistic ceremonies are, in themselves, nothing worth. This apostle asserted “that a man is not justified by the works of the law, but by the faith of Jesus Christ.” He said: “The Scripture hath concluded all under sin, that the promise by faith of Jesus Christ might be given to them that believe;” and, “The law was our school-master to bring us unto Christ, that we might be justified by faith.” Paul adduced as testimony in support of his doctrine the fact that Abraham was justified by faith when the promise was made him by God that he and Sarah should have a son born to them, notwithstanding their power of generation had ceased by reason of

age. It is evident that Abraham—without having performed the deeds enjoined by the law of Moses, and without having received circumcision—was justified by faith; for the faith which was accounted to him for righteousness was exercised, and the justification which he received was conferred, before the law of Moses was given, and before circumcision was instituted. Abraham was, by faith, justified when he was in uncircumcision, and when he was without the works of the law. Therefore the doctrine of justification by faith, without these works, is true. There is no metaphysical jargon in this argument of the apostle, and there is no fallacy in the conclusions reached.

But St. James says: "Ye see then how that by works a man is justified, and not by faith only." (James ii. 24.) Does not this text from James contradict St. Paul where he says: "Therefore we conclude that a man is justified by faith without the deeds of the law?" (Rom. iii. 28.) There is not the slightest discrepancy in the utterances and teachings of these two apostles. In connection with the passages here quoted the authors thereof were considering points of doctrine entirely different, and were combating errors of an entirely different nature. Paul was antagonizing errors advocated by Jews who still adhered to the Mosaic ritual. James was correcting errors held by Jews who allied themselves to the Christian religion. The Jews who still adhered to the Mosaic form of worship put circumcision and ritual services in the place of faith. Paul was opposing this error in particular. The Jews who had renounced the Mosaic forms and had accepted the Christian religion, and to whom James was writing, put a spoken acknowledgment of religion in the place of obedience, or in the place of a working faith. James was correcting this error. Each of these apostles, Paul and James, as he was writing to those familiar with the life and religion of Abraham, appealed

to facts in the life of that patriarch as testimony in support of the position he was advocating. Paul adduced one event in the life of the patriarch, and James adduced another. The ease of Abraham's faith, when Isaac was promised to him by God, served the argument of Paul in the point of doctrine he was establishing. The ease of Abraham's obedience, when he offered Isaac as a sacrifice, served the argument of James in establishing the doctrine he was defending. Abraham was justified by faith, without deeds or works of any sort, when he believed the promise of God concerning the birth of Isaac. He was justified by works when he obeyed the order of God and offered Isaac his son upon the altar built on Mount Moriah. The one ease attests that forgiveness of sins is attained by faith only. The other ease attests the truth that a Christian life can be maintained only by obedience to the law of God, or by a life of Christian work. These two points are in perfect accord. Paul never controverted the doctrine that the Christian must live a life of righteousness and obey the law of God. In the progress of the argument where he is maintaining that the forgiveness of sins is attained by faith without works, this apostle asks, "Shall we continue in sin that grace may abound?" and answers: "God forbid; how shall we that are dead to sin live any longer therein?" And again, he gives to Christians this plain injunction: "Work out your own salvation with fear and trembling." (Phil. ii. 12.)

Good works proceed from a true faith, are the fruits borne by a living faith. Good works do not precede but follow justification, and such good works are pleasing to God; and while good works cannot atone for guilt, and cannot abolish sins, yet such as spring out of this true faith deserve reward, and will secure reward if persevered in to the end. All who are pardoned are pardoned by faith only. All who

have been thus justified are required to work for life, are required to labor for the meat which perishes not, are required to labor for reward. God will reward for these good works required, for they are acceptable to him in Christ Jesus. Let the sinner seek the forgiveness of his sins by faith in Jesus Christ. Let the Christian be careful to maintain good works, and lay hold on eternal life.

“Faith is the substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen.” (Heb. xi. 1.) Faith gives full assurance of the existence of invisible things, and gives power to overcome this present evil world. “This is the victory that overcometh the world, even our faith.” (1 John v. 4.)

Faith lends its realizing light,
The clouds disperse, the shadows fly,
Th' Invisible appears in sight,
And God is seen by mortal eye.

CHAPTER XIII.

REGENERATION.

REGENERATION is the theme for discussion in this chapter. Generation and regeneration, though they are different terms, and though they, as terms, allude to different subjects, are closely allied. "Generate" means to produce, to bring into being, to give birth to. "Regenerate" means to reproduce, to generate anew, to give birth to again. The subject of regeneration is, as a Bible doctrine, connected with that of the natural birth, being born of the flesh; and it is so connected for the reason that regeneration has its existence and its necessity in birthsin, in the natural depravity or the innate corruption of the human heart. These two subjects are thus associated by Jesus in his conversation with Nicodemus: "Except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God. That which is born of the flesh is flesh; and that which is born of the Spirit is spirit." (John iii. 3, 6.) One great underlying fact in which the gospel is founded is that all men are fallen, corrupt, sinful, condemned. That which is born of the flesh is corrupt, evil. Birthsin is cognizable. It impinges the law of God as certainly as does a criminal act of a moral agent. To the nature of a moral being belongs quality. Human nature, as it is generated, or born, is in a state of depravity and criminality. There is in human nature sin, indwelling sin. This sin is not something received into the nature by the recoil of personal acts committed by the individual after his birth, and after he has reached the age of volition and personal agency, but it is that which is

of him, it is antecedent to any actions of his, it is the corruption that naturally is engendered. "Now, then, it is no more I that do it, but sin that dwelleth in me. For I know that in me (that is, in my flesh) dwelleth no good thing." Depravity is inherent in fallen human nature, and this depravity impinges the law of God, and consequently is as criminal as any overt act. This innate corruption, this birthsin, as effectually shuts the soul out of heaven as does any sinful act, and the soul can no more be saved without the removal of this inborn sin than it can be saved without the pardon of sinful actions. "The carnal mind is enmity against God." "To be carnally-minded is death." "That which is born of the flesh is flesh." "Except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God." Jesus shows here that a man is disqualified, by the nature which he receives in his birth, for a place in heaven, and is, by that depraved nature, shut out from the kingdom of God. He is, because of what he is in his birth, out of the kingdom of God, and if he ever enters into that kingdom he must be brought in by a new birth. Every one born into the world is, when born, defiled, carnal, sold under sin, condemned. Were not the heart sinful there would be no necessity for regeneration. Jesus did not say: Nicodemus, *you* must, because of the many overt sins you have committed during your life-time, be born again; but he said: "Except *a man* be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God. That which is born of the flesh is flesh." The Divine Teacher goes back to the native depravity, to the birthsin, to the very nature and state of the race. This language, "Except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God," included Nicodemus, and applied to him because he was of the race; and it included every one of the race, and is alike applicable to all. "The heart is deceitful above all things, and desperately wicked." This text

says the heart, the heart of man, the heart as it is in man's fallen state; and so the heart of every individual, before it is renewed by regeneration, is deceitful, and desperately wicked. "For from within, out of the heart of men, proceed evil thoughts, adulteries, fornications, murders, thefts, covetousness, wickedness, deceit, lasciviousness, an evil eye, blasphemy, pride, foolishness; all these evil things come from within, and defile the man." Were the heart not sinful, evil things could not proceed therefrom. Malice and lustful desires are not acts, but they are beyond question sinful, and so the depravity inherent in human nature is sinful.

Some persons have assumed the position that "nothing is sin but the volitional act of a moral agent," and that infants are not sinners because they are incapable of "volitional acts." This position can never be established while there remain in the Bible the words, "By one man's disobedience many were made sinners." (Rom. v. 19.) These same persons have asserted that the theory which teaches that infants are sinners, and that they are condemned for Adam's sin, was founded in the superstitions of barbarism, and that this theory attributes to God a cruelty which is horrible and an injustice which is shocking to refined sensibilities. But these assertions are disposed of at once by the words of the apostle: "By the offense of one judgment came upon all men to condemnation." (Rom. v. 18.) This passage from the word of God rebukes the heretical twaddle about barbarism, cruelty, and injustice. All have sinned. It is impossible to include infants in the "all men" upon whom the free gift has come in order to justification of life without including them in the "all men" who have sinned, and in the "all men" upon whom judgment has come to condemnation, and in the "all men" upon whom death has passed as a punishment for sin. While

the word of God remains, the assumption that "nothing is sin but the volitional act of a moral agent" is relegated to the class of false things. It is true that where there has never been a moral agent there has never been sin; and it is also true that where there has not been a "volitional act of a moral agent," violating the law of God, there has not been sin; and it is also conceded as true that no man can be praised or blamed for an act to which he has been moved by irresistible force; but this does not in the least affect the doctrine of sin imputed, inherited, naturally engendered, transmitted. A moral agent existed, and there was a "volitional act" violating the law of God before there was ever a child born. That moral agent was Adam, that "volitional act" violating law was the act of Adam eating the fruit of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil. By this one man, Adam, sin entered into the world, and by this one sin of this one man death passed upon all men born into the world.

All men need regeneration, as well infants as adults. The Lord has never declared that infants, without regeneration, are in the kingdom of heaven in any sense that ungodly adults are not in the kingdom of heaven. Adult persons who have never been regenerated, and who are in very deed sinners, are nevertheless in a certain sense of the kingdom of God. The free gift has come upon them in order to the justification of life. In this sense these unregenerated adult sinners are of the kingdom of heaven. Newborn infants are of the kingdom of heaven in the same sense, and in no other. Would as well say that adults who are wicked are not to be brought into the kingdom of heaven at some future time, by regeneration, because the free gift has come upon all men unto justification of life, as to say that for this reason, newborn infants are not to be brought into the kingdom of heaven at some

time subsequent to their birth. The fact that God has taken the whole human race into the provision of reconciliation—has granted life as a free gift—is no evidence that any of that race can be saved without regeneration. Unless infants are regenerated they cannot see the kingdom of God. But where is the trouble about regenerating them? The free gift has come upon them, as well as upon all adult sinners, in order to give life, justification, regeneration, and finished and eternal salvation. Infants, while they are infants, can offer no resistance to the accomplishment of this work. Where, then, is there any difficulty? There is none, except in the minds of visionaries and heretics. It is possible for all men to be regenerated. Regeneration is needed by every human being who has not already been regenerated, and this regeneration can be wrought by the Spirit in every heart which is still under the reclaiming grace of the Son of God.

The Greek word *παλιγγενεσία* is found at Matthew xix. 28, and at Titus iii. 5, and is translated, in the English text, "regeneration." This Greek word means renovation, restoration, reproduction, new birth, new being, transmigration to a new state. Jesus, in his conversation with Nicodemus, presents the same subject of regeneration, or reproduction. In this conversation, Christ says: "*Εαν μη τις γεννηθῆ ἀνωθεν, οὐ δύναται ἰδεῖν τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ.*" This is a plain presentation of the nature, and a positive announcement of the necessity, of the new birth. Unless a man be born from above—be spiritually reproduced—he shall not be able to know the land of God. Every one born of a woman must be born again before he can know and enjoy the kingdom of God.

Regeneration is a change, a reproduction, a new creation of the moral nature of man. It is the production of new principles in the soul. To say, in defining this work,

“there is no need of adding any thing to the machinery” of the sinner’s nature, “God made it, and accordingly it is complete,” is simply to say nothing on the subject worth saying. God made man, and made him complete, but as he is he needs, according to Christ, the great teacher, that which he has not. Regeneration, if it does not add any new faculties, and if it does not impart any new essence to the soul, does, nevertheless, change it. Regeneration changes the soul, taking away from it an evil nature, and imparting to it a good nature. It does something more than give freedom to the soul, it destroys in the soul evil principles, and imparts to it right principles; it destroys in the soul wrath, envy, pride, and all lusts, and imparts love, humility, and benevolence. Knowledge of science is no part of the grace of the gospel. To impart scientific or literary knowledge is no part of the regenerating work of the Spirit. But this is no evidence that regeneration is not a work changing the very nature and principles of the soul. Regeneration is not a progressive but an instantaneous work, and is complete in itself. It no more includes completeness of grace than does any other one phase of religion. It no more takes in and includes in itself a state of sanctification than it takes in and includes in itself development and growth. Would as well contend that the newly regenerated is full-grown as contend that he is necessarily sanctified; and would just as well contend that regeneration is a growth as contend that sanctification is a growth. Sanctification is a higher work; sanctification is a condition of grace beyond and above that of regeneration. There is, of course, no work in the Christian life which “goes forward by spasmodic leaps to a premature perfection, vaulting over all the laws of growth;” and no one of recognized authority on the subject ever claimed such a process, and veracity and intelligence could never intimate that any one ever ad

vocated such a view of the work of sanctification. What sort of a thing is "premature perfection?" There may be growth, and there may be growth in some things which pertain to the Christian for many years, and this is not in conflict with the doctrine of an instantaneous sanctification. A person might be regenerated and sanctified—regenerated in having new principles imparted, and sanctified in being made entirely holy—and still need to grow in some things. A person might be sanctified the next day after he is regenerated, or the next hour after, and this without "ignoring all analogies and all laws," or at least without ignoring any divine law or any true analogy. Sanctification is a distinct attainment, and may be sought and obtained in a few hours, and when wrought in the soul it is instantaneously done, and "spasmodic moods and feelings" have nothing to do with it. Sanctification is the work of God, and is not an extraneous growth attained by human works any more than regeneration is an extraneous growth attained upon the performance of certain good works. Analogies and figures of speech, however arrayed, can never prove any thing. They, for the most part, only serve to conduct wild minds in the strayings of their heresies. Metaphors are very suggestive to erratic fellows who have but little, if any, regard for the truth.

The text, "Though your sins be as scarlet, they shall be as white as snow; though they be red like crimson, they shall be as wool," has by some been adduced to prove that those who have been regenerated have in the same work been sanctified. With equal propriety, and with equal success, this passage may be adduced in proof that those who have been regenerated have in the same work attained finished salvation, and have been glorified. This text will prove the one as conclusively as it will the other. The text, "Whosoever shall call on the name of the Lord shall

be saved," will sustain the position that whosoever calls on the Lord is in that very hour saved in heaven as certainly as the text, "Though your sins be as scarlet, they shall be as white as snow; though they be red like crimson, they shall be as wool," will sustain the position that regeneration and sanctification are one and the same. The author who attempts to maintain that sanctification is not a distinct attainment from regeneration, reached instantaneously by an act of faith, is found involved in endless and infelicitous contradictions. In one place he says: "Regeneration does not remove depravity. The regenerate man is still depraved." In another place he says: "When God regenerates the soul he thoroughly cleanses away all sin. Regeneration removes all the pollution of sin." And again he says: "Regeneration, in its sphere, is complete salvation. Beyond it we are not to expect a separate and distinct work of grace, introducing new spiritual relations and conditions." "Sanctification is never presented as something apart from regeneration." And in yet another place he says: "Regeneration is not to be confounded with justification, conversion or sanctification." Such contradictions as these are not to be accepted certainly for their own sake, and they can never inspire confidence in the correctness of the theory in the support of which they are made. Regeneration is an internal and spiritual work wrought by divine agency. To be regenerated, or "born again," does not mean to be born again of natural parents, but it means to be "born of God," to be "born from above," to be renewed, recreated by the Holy Ghost. Whoever is regenerated has a new inward nature, a new spiritual being, and is spiritually-minded, having the Spirit of God dwelling in him. The "inward man," mentioned by the apostle Paul in his Epistles, is not that which pertains distinctively to a regenerate soul, but is that which is com-

mon alike to all men—to the regenerate and to the unregenerate. The regenerated person has “the inward man,” but he has something besides. He has “received the spirit of adoption,” “he is a new creature,” and is “free from the law of sin and death.” The conflict described by the apostle Paul, in the seventh chapter of Romans, is not the conflict incident to the being and life of a regenerate man, but it is the conflict incident to the being and life of an unregenerate man, who has perceived in his own mind the truth as set forth under the light of the gospel of God. And when the apostle says, “For that which I do, I allow not; for what I would, that do I not; but what I hate, that do I,” he is not describing *two men*, nor *two selves*, but he is describing the struggle going on with the one man while the element of righteousness presented to the moral perception of the man and the indwelling sin innate to him contend against each other for the mastery. Righteousness, when perceived by the mind through the light of the word and Spirit of God, is beautiful even to the sinner, and when thus seen it incites him to serve the law of God; but the flesh, which engenders lusts, impels him to serve the law of sin. Thus the struggle goes on, the conflict rages, with the unregenerate. But the regenerate man struggles under no such distractions. He is after the Spirit, he minds the things of the Spirit, and he has life and peace. He no longer cries out, “O wretched man that I am! who shall deliver me from the body of this death?” But the Spirit of adoption cries in him, “Abba, Father!” The Spirit himself bears witness with his spirit that he is a child of God.

Here is a sinner; he is unrenewed; sin dwells in him; he serves sin; sin works in him all manner of concupiscence; indwelling sin dominates him; but he has the light of the gospel of the Son of God. The gospel shows him

his sin, and the way of deliverance therefrom. Light and darkness are set before him. Good and evil, life and death are presented to him. He struggles under a fearful conflict. The beauties of righteousness are attractive. He desires righteousness that he may be happy and have eternal life. But he desires the gratification of his carnal nature. He loves darkness because his lusts prompt him to deeds of evil. To take this case of this sinner as a scriptural presentation of the ease of a regenerated soul is to pervert the teachings of the word of God in a most pitiable manner.

Regeneration, being an internal work, changes the heart, not the politics, of the person. Being an internal work, regeneration is not produced by baptism. Water, with all its inherent properties, and baptism, with all the functions with which it is clothed, cannot wash and renew the soul. Baptism is a sign, seal, and pledge of regeneration, but is not the regeneration itself. Baptism is a means of grace, and more, but it neither contains nor confers the grace of regeneration. That baptism is a means of grace is shown by Christ himself, and by the apostle Paul, though neither of these made it an indispensable and universal condition of salvation. "Jesus answered, Verily, verily, I say unto thee, Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God." (John iii. 5.) "Not by works of righteousness which we have done, but according to his mercy he saved us, by the washing of regeneration, and renewing of the Holy Ghost." (Titus iii. 5.) Christ, by "water," and Paul, by "washing," mean baptism. Baptism, the assertion of some to the contrary notwithstanding, was in existence as an ordinance when Christ was teaching in the earth. John the Baptist and the disciples of Christ had baptized many previous to the date of Christ's conversation with Nicodemus. If the word

“wash,” when it is used in some places in the Scriptures, does refer to the work performed by the direct agency of God, it does not follow as an inevitable conclusion that baptize never means to wash. The word “baptize” means to wash, and the Bible, in many forms, speaks of baptism as washing, and in one place the charge is given: “Be baptized, and wash away thy sins.” But the water of baptism washes away sins only sacramentally, ceremonially, symbolically. Why should water be chosen as the element used in baptism? Because it has cleansing properties, and in its use the sacrament is emblematical of the internal cleansing which it signifies, or of which it is a sign. Baptism has a sacramental power, and sacramental authority, not because of the pristine origin of water, not because there is any divine element in water, but because God instituted baptism a sacrament. There is not a divine element in water any more than there is a divine element in sand, or in clay, but there is a divine element in baptism because God has instituted it a sacrament in his Church. Baptism can never wash sin from the conscience, can never regenerate and purify the heart, but it is a divine ordinance, it is a sacred washing, nevertheless. Let the efficacy of water baptism be properly defined and clearly comprehended, and there need be no confusion on the subject of its agency and power in the work of regeneration. The soul, before it can be saved, must be washed and renewed by the Holy Ghost. Should Christendom bring into direct manipulations all her agencies, and concentrate all her rites and ceremonies upon the regeneration of a soul, the effort would be as futile as would be the effort to create a world, or make a God. It does not follow, however, that men are altogether passive in the work of regeneration, and that the preaching of the gospel, and the administration of the sacraments of the Church, have nothing to do with their salva-

tion. It is true: "The condition of man after the fall of Adam is such that he cannot turn and prepare himself, by his own natural strength and works, to faith, and calling upon God; wherefore we have no power to do good works, pleasant and acceptable to God, without the grace of God by Christ preventing us, that we may have a good will, and working with us, when we have that good will." Men, though fallen, and in themselves helpless, can, by the prevenient grace which they have received through Jesus Christ, coöperate in the work of their salvation. All men are endowed with moral agency, and have the ability to accept or reject the gospel. Prevenient grace, grace which goes before regeneration, has been conferred upon all men through Jesus Christ. This grace assists the will, so that all men are responsible agents, and the attainment of salvation, as well as its rejection, is possible to them. Through the preaching of the gospel, and the due administration of the sacraments, as well as through the many agencies and means of grace which are in operation, God calls responsible men to repentance and faith. He calls them to obtain salvation through Jesus Christ. "For the grace of God that bringeth salvation hath appeared to all men, teaching us that, denying ungodliness and worldly lusts, we should live soberly, righteously, and godly, in this present world; looking for that blessed hope, and the glorious appearing of the great God and our Saviour Jesus Christ; who gave himself for us, that he might redeem us from all iniquity, and purify unto himself a peculiar people, zealous of good works." (Titus ii. 11-14.) "For this is good and acceptable in the sight of God our Saviour; who will have all men to be saved, and to come unto the knowledge of the truth." (1 Tim. ii. 3, 4.)

These passages of the divine word abound with assurance that grace and light through Jesus Christ have been given

to all men, and that men are made responsible to God, the Judge of all, for their conduct, and that they are to be workers together with God in the achievement of their salvation. The man described by the apostle Paul with such perspicuity in the seventh chapter of Romans, and to which allusion has already been made, testifies to the doctrine of prevenient grace, and that the gospel produces effects upon unregenerate men. This man was one enlightened by the law and Spirit of God—one who had been awakened and convicted. He saw the truth, and trembled at the fearful doom depicted by the word of the Lord God. The light of the grace of God had shone into his heart. He consented to the teachings and requirements of the divine law. He acknowledged that the law is good, just, and right. But with all he does not consent to do that which he himself allows to be properly demanded of him. Indwelling sin dominates him, and he fails to do that which he allows to be right and just. Nevertheless, he has the grace, light, and conviction which, if followed, will eventuate in his regeneration and salvation. This very man, struggling under the bondage of indwelling sin, consenting to the law that it is just, and desiring the blessings which come through God's righteous methods, witnesses that even the unregenerate have grace and light sufficient to be responsible agents, and grace and light sufficient to save them, provided they renounce their sins and accept the gospel blessings upon the conditions prescribed. Men hear the word of truth, the gospel of salvation; they implicitly believe the word, they unreservedly trust in Christ, and are sealed with the Holy Spirit of promise. Men are saved by grace, are quickened and saved by God, but it is through faith. Christians are God's workmanship, created in Christ Jesus, but they are created in Christ Jesus that they should walk in good works, for so has God ordained. Conviction, confession, and re-

penitance precede faith, and faith precedes regeneration. The regeneration is wrought by God, but the confession, repentance, and faith are the acts of the man regenerated. While baptism and the Lord's Supper cannot regenerate the soul, their administration and reception may be beneficial, and as the sacraments and ordained agencies of the gospel, they may aid in the work. Baptism is a means of grace, and the Lord's Supper is none the less so, and the influence and benefits of these sacraments are more and greater than ordinary means of grace. -

Some have maintained that in order to produce that amendment of the heart called regeneration, nothing is requisite but to put the body in a sound state by the power of physic, and set truth and falsehood, virtue and vice, before the understanding and the will in such clearness and distinctness that their nature and properties may be correctly apprehended. The whole work has been accredited to the influence of the written word of God, operating on the human mind in the same manner as any ordinary truth. Flagellations and washings of the body have been resorted to as the means for attaining the end sought. But neither flagellations of the body, however severe, nor washings thereof, however thorough, nor applications of physic, however cautiously and skillfully administered, for setting the body in a good habit, can effect a change of the heart. It is ridiculous, impious, and sacrilegious to do such things in the name of religion. Such heretical performances outrage all simplicity of doctrine and all purity of thought, and put to the rack reason and common sense. Credulity, fondness of novelty, presumption and vanity, must be ruling elements in the composition of those who advocate such things in the name of Christianity. These persons abound more in supereilious ambiguities than in sagacity and veracity. Their methods are visionary and arbitrary rather

than logical and philosophical, and even their zeal is only less contemptible than their pomposity and their self-sufficiency. True benevolence and sublime virtue can never be found associated with such men and such doctrines.

Man, though possessed of rites and ceremonies, of sacraments and ordinances, is impotent. The Ethiopian cannot change his skin, nor the leopard his spots; no more can a man who is accustomed to do evil change his nature. Superhuman power is necessary to effect the moral change called regeneration. The Holy Ghost can do the work. He knows all truth, he is the author and master of all mysteries, and he has all power, so that he can do all things necessary to the renovation and renewal of the human heart. He is not simply an influence, an operation, a quality, or a power, he is a being, having life in and of himself. He is God. He is omnipresent, omniscient, and omnipotent. Glory and majesty are his. Inexhaustible resources are inherent, and he does whatsoever he pleases. He hath not only "garnished the heavens," he hath created them. He "by his strength setteth fast the mountains," and "he taketh up the isles as a very little thing;" he made "the highest part of the dust of the world." "He stretcheth out the north over the empty place, and hangeth the earth upon nothing." Mighty signs and wonders have been wrought by him. Even devils, with all their stratagems, treacheries, malignity, and violence, are subject to his power and under his control, and he drives them forth at will. How pure and lovely and gentle is the Holy Spirit! He moves "upon the face of the waters" now, then he descends like a dove, and yet again appears in the form of tongues of fire. When the Spirit enters the human heart, he enters not by force, nor in rudeness, but gently, peaceably. When the Spirit enters the human heart in regenerating power, he destroys in that heart "the body of sin," and implants the

principles of righteousness and imparts the image of God. For as many as have "the Spirit of Christ are his," and "as many as are led by the Spirit of God, they are the sons of God." When this work of imparting righteous principles to the soul is wrought, and this high state of being the sons of God is conferred, thereto the witness of the Spirit is given. The testimony given the spirit of the child of God is intelligible and satisfactory. What this witness of the Spirit is every child of God understands in his own heart, and without any communications and instructions from any other source. The subject of the witness of the Spirit is one of profound importance, and it should be treated with the gravest consideration. It is a subject upon which the Scriptures have spoken clearly and exhaustively, and as a dogma information concerning it can be obtained only from the Scriptures. No scientific discovery nor philosophical investigation can bring any knowledge or help to any understanding of the doctrine. The subject is as distinct from and independent of nature and nature's laws as is God himself. Would as well undertake to discover God and his perfections by mathematical processes as to endeavor to learn the doctrine of the Spirit's testimony to the human heart from nature's teachings, or from the order of natural things. It is a subject too profound for mere logic, and it is too sublime for the ornamentations of ordinary rhetoric, though it must not be treated illogically, nor presented in naked deformity. It would be proper, should a logical statement of the subject be attempted, to set it forth in the following manner: What the Scriptures teach is true; the Scriptures teach the doctrine of the witness of the Spirit; therefore the doctrine of the witness of the Spirit is true. It must be admitted that God can communicate truths and principles to men, and that he has communicated a knowledge of divine things to them, or the claims of the

Christian religion to respectful consideration must be denied. The Spirit of God communicates to intelligent moral beings, and the human consciousness tests and attests the communications and revelations. In proof that the Holy Spirit can and does communicate with men, and make known to them the things of God, a few of the many passages of Scripture bearing on the point may be given. The premise in the syllogism given above, which by the laws of logic needs to be proved, will be also established by these passages:

“For David himself said by the Holy Ghost, The Lord said to my Lord, Sit thou on my right-hand, till I make thine enemies thy footstool.” (Mark xii. 36.) “But when they shall lead you, and deliver you up, take no thought beforehand what ye shall speak, neither do ye premeditate; but whatsoever shall be given you in that hour, that speak ye; for it is not ye that speak, but the Holy Ghost.” (Mark xiii. 11.) “And Elizabeth was filled with the Holy Ghost, and she spake out with a loud voice.” “And his father Zacharias was filled with the Holy Ghost, and prophesied.” (Luke i. 41, 42, 67.) “And it was revealed unto him by the Holy Ghost that he should not see death before he had seen the Lord’s Christ.” (Luke ii. 26.) “For the Holy Ghost shall teach you in the same hour what ye ought to say.” (Luke xii. 12.) “After that he through the Holy Ghost had given commandments unto the apostles whom he had chosen.” (Acts i. 2.) “Which the Holy Ghost by the mouth of David spake before concerning Judas.” (Acts i. 16.) “Then Peter, filled with the Holy Ghost, said unto them.” (Acts iv. 8.) “And we are his witnesses of these things; and so is also the Holy Ghost, whom God hath given to them that obey him.” (Acts v. 32.) “Well spake the Holy Ghost by Esaias the prophet unto our fathers.” (Acts xxviii. 25.) “Because the love of God is

shed abroad in our hearts by the Holy Ghost, which is given unto us." (Rom. v. 5.) "My conscience also bearing me witness in the Holy Ghost." (Rom. ix. 1.) "Which things also we speak, not in the words which man's wisdom teacheth, but which the Holy Ghost teacheth." (1 Cor. ii. 13.) "Whereof the Holy Ghost also is a witness to us." (Heb. x. 15.) "For the propheey came not in old time by the will of man; but holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost." (2 Pet. i. 21.)

These passages from the divine record establish the points for which they are brought, and they show that men have received from the Holy Ghost the words and will of God; and also that they have imparted to them, by the Holy Ghost, communications, graces, and assurances which do not otherwise belong to them, and which are not conferred through other agencies. This is an end to all controversy as to the possibility of making such communications, and as to the fact that they are so made. Then there are other passages which might be given, showing that the Spirit associates with and assists the Christian, such as: "Likewise the Spirit also helpeth our infirmities; for we know not what we should pray for as we ought; but the Spirit itself maketh intercession for us with groanings which cannot be uttered." (Rom. viii. 26.) But there is one passage so direct and conclusive that others are really not needed to help to an understanding of the subject: "For ye have not received the spirit of bondage again to fear; but ye have received the Spirit of adoption, whereby we cry, Abba, Father. The Spirit itself beareth witness with our spirit, that we are the children of God." (Rom. viii. 15, 16.) This text and the doctrine it teaches cannot be misunderstood, however men may pervert the same. The Spirit has been received by the Christian. The testimony given is given by the Spirit himself, not by nor through some one else, or

by some other agent, or agency. The testimony is given directly to the spirit of the Christian. Thoughts, ideas, and truths cannot be deposited in vacuity. These are lodged with a thinking being, and are conveyed from one intelligent being to another. It is impossible for that which is to be communicated from God to a human spirit to be first an isolated deposit laid in vacuity to be afterward taken up and transmitted to the spirit for whom it was intended by some third party deputed therefor. Intermediate agents and intervening channels are certainly not needed in bearing testimony to the children of God by the Holy Ghost. But the apostle has settled the question. He says: "The Spirit himself beareth witness [not by the word, not by some one else, but] with our spirit." And then he bears witness, not to something of a vague or of a general nature, but to the special fact that the individual is a child of God. The Spirit may not speak in audible tones, but he imparts the information, nevertheless; and it is as satisfactorily done as if done in audible tones. Neither the sound of the earthquake, nor the roar of the sea, nor the noise of the storm, nor the voice of the thunder, is essential to the Holy Ghost in making communications of truth to the spirits of the children of God.

"Blessed are the pure in heart, for they shall see God." Sanctification, like regeneration, is wrought in the human heart by the Holy Ghost. It is holiness imparted to the soul by the Divine Spirit. Holiness is a quality. Holiness of heart is a quality or state of heart in which there is no sin, no corruption, no impurity. It does not consist in being consecrated to some calling, or office, through some ecclesiastical manipulations. Sanctifying is sometimes mentioned in the Bible as separating from common uses and setting apart to sacred purposes. But holiness is a state conferred upon the child of God by cleansing the moral

nature from sin, from indwelling sin, from all impurity of soul, by the sanctifying operations of the Holy Ghost. This holiness is not constituted of repentance, nor of faith, nor of any act, however good the act. He who has been made holy has repented, has obtained precious faith, loves God, is adorned outwardly with all the graces of the gospel, and conforms all his conduct to the perfect law of God. These—faith, love, obedience, humility, and meekness—may flow from holiness, and may be evidences of its existence in the heart, but they do not constitute the holiness itself. Holiness is a quality in the sanctified heart, in the perfect Christian, just as malleability is a property of gold, or brittleness is a property of glass. The Christian who has been sanctified is perfect, even as God, his Father in heaven, is perfect. And still there is a difference in the holiness of God and the holiness of a perfect Christian. In God, holiness has never been acquired; it is one thing which belongs essentially to him. In the perfect Christian, holiness has been inwrought through sanctification of the Holy Spirit. In God, holiness exists in that degree which pertains only to a divine being. In the perfect Christian, holiness exists in that degree which belongs to a perfect man. As a quality, holiness is the same in the perfect Christian that it is in God, but the degree of holiness in God exceeds the degree of it in man as much as God excels the man; and in this the words of Hannah are true: "There is none holy as the Lord; for there is none besides thee." (1 Sam. ii. 2.)

This holiness is attainable in this life. It must be secured before departing from this life as a qualification for admission into the final and eternal inheritance. To all who seek it, it is promised, and all are admonished to follow after and obtain it. "Follow peace with all men, and holiness, without which no man shall see the Lord." (Heb. xii. 14.) "Put on the new man, which after God is created

in righteousness and true holiness." (Eph. iv. 24.) "For God hath not called us unto uncleanness, but unto holiness." (1 Thess. iv. 7.) "Be ye holy; for I am holy." (1 Pet. i. 16.) "And the very God of peace sanctify you wholly; and I pray God your whole spirit and soul and body be preserved blameless unto the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ." (1 Thess. v. 23.)

Multiplied quotations might be given bearing on the subject, but quotations interminable are not necessary. The Epistle to the Hebrews asserts that for their "profit," and to the end that they "might be partakers of his holiness," those "whom the Lord loveth he chasteneth, and scourgeth every son whom he receiveth." The apostle Peter, in his Second Epistle, teaches that to those who have obtained "precious faith" are given "exceeding great and precious promises," in order that they might through these "be partakers of the divine nature, having escaped the corruption that is in the world through lust."

The pure in heart, the sanctified, the perfect, have access to God, commune with him, love him with all the heart, and obey him with all the soul and strength. These sanctified Christians love one another sincerely. "Seeing ye have purified your souls in obeying the truth through the Spirit unto unfeigned love of the brethren, see that ye love one another with a pure heart fervently." (1 Pet. i. 22.) They love all men, and they distribute blessings upon all men to the extent of their ability. "As we have therefore opportunity, let us do good unto all men, especially unto them who are of the household of faith." (Gal. vi. 10.) There are some things, however, which religion neither enables nor requires the Christian to do. There are things which even a perfect Christian cannot apprehend, and unto which he cannot attain. Much damage results to the cause of Christianity by not properly understanding the truth at

this very point. Many, for the very reason that they have not understood the truth involved here, have undervalued their religious experience, and have given themselves up to doubt and despondency. The Christian, however perfect he may be, cannot be indifferent to injuries done him, and to indignities laid upon him; he cannot be insensible to pain and grief. The Christian will not harbor malice, will not give vent to wrath, will not seek revenge, will not allow anger to rest in his bosom, but the righteousness which is in him, and the love of truth and justice, will prompt him to hate and denounce the deeds of the corrupt, and the works of the wicked. It is as much the duty of the Christian to withstand evil influences, and all those who dissemble, all "whosoever loveth and maketh a lie," as it is to love his enemies, and to pray for those who spitefully use him. When "he that holdeth the seven stars in his right-hand, who walketh in the midst of the seven golden candlesticks," recounted the things which he saw in the Church of Ephesus, he said with approbation: "But this thou hast, that thou hatest the deeds of the Nicolaitans, which I also hate." (Rev. ii. 6.) The Christian is liable to sorrow, and acquainted with grief. He rests under many chastisements. Job was a perfect man, and a patient man, but he lost much, and suffered much; he suffered great deprivation. "His grief was very great." He poured out his complaint before God. The misery which was in his bones and in his flesh was real and indescribable, and the anguish of his soul was intolerable. His complaint was as bitter and vehement as his disease was excruciating and wasting. In his deep anguish he cried out: "O that I might have my request; and that God would grant me the thing that I long for! Even that it would please God to destroy me; that he would let loose his hand, and cut me off!" (Job vi. 8, 9.) Thus, in the bitterness of his cou-

suming agony, did Job make and justify his complaint. In making this complaint there was no sin. The Christian, on his couch, suffering torture and wasting with disease, may very properly groan and sigh; and, when under some dire calamity which has fallen upon him, he is prostrated, he may, in lamentation, give expression to his grief.

CHAPTER XIV.

THE SACRAMENTS OF THE CHURCH—BAPTISM AND THE
LORD'S SUPPER.

THE Church and the sacraments thereof are not to be passed in silence in treating the great subject of salvation from sin.

THE CHURCH OF GOD.

These words name it. These words define it in so far as it can be defined by words. Other words may describe it. The Church had its inception in the mind of God. It was evolved with the scheme of human redemption, and as a chosen entity, constituted of laws and precepts, adapted to ordinances and man's estate, it was an essential institution in the provision made for the worship of God and the salvation of man. As a system constituted of the principles which sum the economy of God in the salvation of man—as an embodiment of the laws of the government, worship, and grace in God's dispensation to fallen man—the Church is “the pillar and ground of the truth.” As a structure, existing in its plans and purposes, principles and adaptations, it was presented by God to Adam when he announced to him the seed of the woman. God set up the Church with Adam when he made his covenant with him in Christ.

The Church in visible organization contains a company of persons, but not every company of individuals constitute or belong to the Church. An association of pirates plotting robbery, an assembly of lawless and infuriated persons seeking destruction, constitute a congregation drawn out and separated (*εξελλησται*), but do not constitute the Church

of God. A congregation to be of the Church of God must be associated, under the gospel, in the worship and service of God. There must be a dispensation and an administration, under divine provision, according to the divine word and will.

Many who claim to be teachers in divine things maintain that the baptism of John was the beginning of the gospel, and that the Church of God was first established or set up on the day of Pentecost, fifty days after the resurrection and ten days after the ascension of the Lord Jesus. They teach that previous to this men groped in darkness without revelation and without the light and offices of the Holy Ghost. They assert that all the promises made to the patriarchs and to the Jews under the Mosaic régime had reference to political economy, social status, and temporal benefits; a heritage of political immunity, of oil and butter, of corn and wine, of milk and honey. They herald it as their belief that before the death and ascension of the Lord Jesus the doctrines of the resurrection of the dead, the immortality of the soul, a day of judgment, and a future state of awards were unknown; that the light which brought to view or made known a future life of immortality was first given at the resurrection of Jesus. But all this is without any warrant from the Scriptures—is, in fact, repugnant thereto. As the Articles of Religion state, “They are not to be heard who feign that the old fathers did look only for transitory promises.”

The gospel of Christ was preached, and the Church of God was set up in the beginning. “In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God.” “Neither is there salvation in any other; for there is none other name under heaven given among men whereby we must be saved.” (Acts iv. 12.) That there is no salvation in any other than in Jesus was as true in the time

of David, of Job, of Enoch, and of Abel, as it is to-day. In the name of Jesus Christ of Nazareth, and in that name alone, has any one of any age found salvation. The patriarchs and prophets believed in Jesus, and they trusted in his sacrificial death as did James and John, as did Timothy and Titus. The saints who lived before the crucifixion looked to the cross in like manner as did those who lived after the crucifixion. Those who lived back in patriarchal times gloried in the cross in the same manner as did Paul. On Calvary, in the middle of the centuries, is seen the cross on which the Lord of glory died. Those who were saved in the ages before the crucifixion looked forward to this cross; those saved in the ages after the crucifixion look back to it. The saints of all ages meet at the cross. The one Church of the living God, sweeping in the duration of her existence from the first to the last generation on earth, is "built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief Corner-stone."

Jesus Christ abolished death, and brought life and immortality to light through the gospel, as the apostle, in writing to Timothy, asserted; but life and immortality were brought to light by him through the gospel, and given to the first generations of the race, as well as to those of apostolic times. The light of the gospel illumined the patriarchal ages. The patriarchs and prophets were fully instructed in the will of God and in the doctrines of redemption. All the doctrines known and preached by the apostles were known and preached by the prophets and by the patriarchs, including those of the first generation. The gospel was preached to Adam and to Abel, and the Church of God was set up with them. Abel was a member of the Church of Christ. He died a witness to God's method of saving men through Jesus Christ. He was the first one who died for his testimony of righteousness, he was the first one who

died for his fidelity to the Son of God. He was the first martyr. Noah was a preacher in the Church of Christ, for he was "a preacher of righteousness." In Noah's time and in Paul's day righteousness was the same thing, and to the antediluvians Noah preached the same righteousness that Paul preached to Felix and his wife Drusilla. The righteousness preached by the one and the other was attained through and enforced by Jesus Christ. "And Enoch also, the seventh from Adam, prophesied of these, saying, Behold, the Lord cometh with ten thousand of his saints, to execute judgment upon all, and to convince all that are ungodly among them of all their ungodly deeds which they have ungodly committed, and of all their hard speeches which ungodly sinners have spoken against him." (Jude 14, 15.) Enoch and Paul proclaimed the same Lord, and Enoch portrayed him coming to judgment in fiery indignation against the ungodly just as Paul portrayed him when "he reasoned of righteousness, temperance, and judgment to come." Jesus, the Messiah, was the theme of the prophets and the patriarchs. They preached him in all the facts and doctrines of his Messiahship and mission. They believed on him and rejoiced in him. They were made happy by him while they were living, and through him they died in hope of eternal salvation. "These all died in faith, not having received the promises, but having seen them afar off, and were persuaded of them, and embraced them, and confessed that they were strangers and pilgrims on the earth. For they that say such things declare plainly that they seek a country. And truly, if they had been mindful of that country from whence they came out, they might have had opportunity to have returned. But now they desire a better country, that is, a heavenly; wherefore God is not ashamed to be called their God; for he hath prepared for them a city. . . . And these all, having obtained a good re-

port through faith, received not the promise; God having provided some better thing for us, that they without us should not be made perfect." (Heb. xi. 13-16; 39, 40.) This portion of the inspired book demonstrates that those here alluded to and named by the apostle, 'beginning with Abel and ending with the last of the prophets, were persons with Christian faith, looking to a future state, having promise and hope of a future inheritance in the eternal city of God. They had the same faith and the same Saviour which belonged to Christians of apostolic times. They sought the same heavenly city which was sought by Christians under the ministry of the apostles. They died in confident expectation of the same better inheritance, than is to be found here on the earth, in the everlasting kingdom of God which animated the departing saints of the apostolic dispensation.

The Church, originating with God, and set up in the covenant made with apostate Adam and his posterity, has had her ordinances in all the ages of her existence, but of these ordinances in the earlier and past dispensations it is not necessary to speak particularly. In the present ordering of the Church—and the present order is to continue until the end of time—there are two sacraments, and these demand recognition and treatment.

The subject of baptism has been carefully studied, thoroughly searched, and fully discussed. The things once hidden therein have long since been discovered and set forth in a clear light. There is nothing novel about the subject at the present time, but still as a theme for study and discussion it is far from being "empty, void, and waste." A patient study thereof will always repay those who desire the welfare of Zion, and those who wish to walk in the light of the Lord.

It is proposed to consider in the present discussion, first, the character and purpose of baptism.

An understanding of the nature of sinful men, and the nature of the work to be wrought in their salvation, will help to a comprehension of the character and purpose of this ordinance of the Christian Church. Men, in their natural state, are polluted and guilty, unrighteous and unclean. They need cleansing grace and an absolving act. To renovate them, wash them, and make them holy, is the work of the gospel. Holiness is the climax in the condition of being. The gospel, in its purposes and plans, is in accord with this truth. God is pure, heaven is pure. Men, if they will be allied to God, and if they will reside at last where he is, must be pure. Holiness is befitting in the house of God. More comely than those who have been decked with "rows of jewels" and "chains of gold" is he who has been adorned with "the beauty of holiness." To go "to the mountain of myrrh and to the hill of frankincense" is far less delightful than to stand upon the "holy hill of Zion," and within the gates of the "holy city." To purify unto himself a people is the purpose of Christ in the gospel, and in this the sacrament of baptism has its significance. Baptism is the sacrament wherein the cleansing of the soul by the blood of Jesus is represented.

The meaning of the words used in designating this sacrament must be ascertained and exhibited. Those who advocate the doctrine that immersion, and nothing but immersion, is baptism—making much of the fact that the Greek words used in the New Testament to designate this ordinance have been, in the English version, Anglicized or transferred, and not translated—persist in translating these Greek words according to their theory. They translate the noun *Βαπτισμα*, *immersion*; the noun *Βαπτιστης*, *immerser*; the verb *Βαπτίζω*, *immerse*; and the participle, *Βαπτισθεις*, *immersed*. They put baptism, as a word and as an ordinance, out of the Bible. But this sacrament of the Chris-

tian Church cannot be properly designated by any word in the English language except the word "baptism," and its cognates. This word, specific in its aim, broad and comprehensive in its meaning, names and defines the subject admirably and exactly. No other word answers the purpose. "Immerse," "dip," and "submerge," each and all, are terms too limited to express the nature of this institution of the Church of God. One might be immersed and not baptized; might be dipped and not baptized; might be submerged and not in any sense baptized. But though to utter it is only to utter a truism, whoever is baptized is baptized. What is the meaning of "immerse?" What is the meaning of "dip?" "Immerse—to plunge into any thing that surrounds or covers, especially into a fluid; to dip; to sink; to bury; to immerge." "Dip—to plunge, to immerse. To insert in a fluid." To immerse is simply to put into the fluid, and not to take out of it. Those who immerse individuals in order to baptize them, do more than immerse their subjects. They take them out of the water, whereas if they only immersed them they would leave them under the water. And this act of putting persons into the water and taking them out will require two words to express that which is done. It will require the word *immerse* and the word *emerge*. The word "immerse" means to sink into a fluid. "Emerge" means to rise out of a fluid. Simply to immerse persons would drown them, unless they by their own efforts should escape the fate. The substitution of immersion for baptism is preposterous, not to say impertinent. With deliberation and with promptness it is here admitted that the terms "pour" and "sprinkle," like the terms "immerse" and "dip," are too limited in their meaning to properly name and define this institution of the gospel.

Sometimes the language used in a sentence states the thing done without the slightest intimation of the mode by

which the thing is effected. Sometimes the language used states the thing done and the mode of effecting it. An example of one and the other may be given: "Then came to him the disciples of John." (Matt. ix. 14.) This simply says the disciples of John came, without giving any intimation of their manner of travel or mode of conveyance. "Minding himself to go afoot." (Acts xx. 13.) This expresses the mode of travel—tells not only of his going, but the manner.

Baptism is a general term of designation, and not a term expressive of mode; and so are its cognates. "John did baptize in the wilderness." (Mark i. 4.) This tells *what* was done, *by whom* it was done, and *where* it was done; but *how* it was done is not stated. "I baptize with water." (John i. 26.) This states *what* was done, *by whom* it was done, and *with what* it was done; but *how* it was done is not made known. The mode is not stated, the manner is not indicated.

What is the meaning of the word "baptism?" *Βαπτίζω*, purify; *βαπτισμα*, purification. Baptize means to purify; baptism means purification. Baptism as a sacrament in the Church is an ordinance of purification. The words of the Scriptures vindicate the meaning here given. "Then there arose a question between some of John's disciples and the Jews about purifying. And they came unto John, and said unto him, Rabbi, he that was with thee beyond Jordan, to whom thou bearest witness, behold, the same baptizeth, and all men come to him." (John iii. 25, 26.) There was rivalry between the followers of Jesus and the disciples of John. One party contended that Jesus alone had authority to have baptism administered, and that all should follow him; and the other party insisted that John was the proper custodian of the ordinance, and that all should be his disciples. The controversy was exclusively about bap-

tism as administered by Jesus and by John. What is spoken of as *purifying* in one verse is spoken of in the other verses as *baptizing*. This is a demonstration that with Jesus and John, and with their followers, baptism meant purification. These Jews were familiar with purifications, and they set great estimate upon them, for they had their *δυναμεις βαπτισμοις*, "divers washings."

Agreeing exactly with the meaning to purify is also the meaning to wash. Isaiah, in a very minute prophecy concerning the humiliation and suffering, the exaltation and glory, of the Son of God, says: "So shall he sprinkle many nations." (Isa. lii. 15.) "Then will I sprinkle clean water upon you, and ye shall be clean; from all your filthiness, and from all your idols, will I cleanse you. A new heart also will I give you, and a new spirit will I put within you; and I will take away the stony heart out of your flesh, and I will give you a heart of flesh." (Ezek. xxxvi. 25, 26.) The prophet Ezekiel doubtless refers here to the purifications and washings performed through the ritual services provided for under the law of Moses; but, at the same time he was proclaiming, in specific prophecy the Christ, and was most graphically describing the work and the blessings of his kingdom in the earth. It is clean water here named. Water, clean water, is to be used in the sacrament of baptism, because it has cleansing properties, and its use is to signify the cleansing of the heart by the blood of the Christ. To this prophecy of Ezekiel, and to the washings under the Mosaic ritual, no doubt the following passages of the New Testament allude: "Christ also loved the Church, and gave himself for it; that he might sanctify and cleanse it with the washing of water by the word, that he might present it to himself a glorious Church, not having spot, or wrinkle, or any such thing; but that it should be holy and without blemish." (Eph. v. 25-27.) "But

according to his mercy he saved us, by the washing of regeneration, and renewing of the Holy Ghost." (Titus iii. 5.) "Let us draw near with a true heart in full assurance of faith, having our hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience, and our bodies washed with pure water." (Heb. x. 22.) That baptism means washing, and that its significance, at least in part, is found in this, is conclusively shown by the text: "And now why tarriest thou? arise, and be baptized, and wash away thy sins, calling on the name of the Lord." (Acts xxii. 16.)

In some places in the New Testament the Greek word βαπτισμους is used in the sense of washing, and in these places it will not bear any other meaning. "And many other things there be, which they have received to hold, as the washing [βαπτισμους] of cups, and pots, brazen vessels, and of tables." (Mark vii. 4.) The "American Bible Union," constituted of Baptists, has made and published a version of the New Testament in which baptism does not appear. This version has it: "In those days comes John the Immerser." "And they were all immersed by him in the Jordan." This version of the New Testament, published under the auspices of the "American Bible Union," gives this part of the fourth verse of the seventh chapter of Mark thus: "And there are many other things which they receive to hold, immersions of cups, and pots, and brazen vessels and couches." This rendering is inconsistent with obvious truth. Only sectarian bigotry and blind fanaticism could lead men into such absurdity. Certainly no people ever had such customs as immersing their pots, tables, and couches, every day. The translators of King James's Version, following common sense, preserving the unity of the statement of the case, and governed by the meaning of the Greek word found in the text, translated it *washing*.

The words *και διαφοροις βαπτισμοις* (Heb. ix. 10) are, in the King James Version, translated, "and divers washings." The "American Bible Union" translates these words, "and divers immersions." Under the Mosaic economy—to the customs of which these words allude—there were various washings, but no immersions. There was sprinkling of water, blood, and ashes, but no submerging, plunging, or drowning. Therefore, there can be no reason, either in the meaning of the word in the Greek, or in the things named and alluded to in the scope of the passage, for the translation made by the sectarians of the "American Bible Union."

To baptize is to separate, initiate, dedicate, bring into covenant, affirm a covenant. These significations of baptism are found in the text (1 Cor. x. 1, 2): "Moreover, brethren, I would not that ye should be ignorant how that all our fathers were under the cloud, and all passed through the sea; and were all baptized unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea." In passing, by miraculous interposition, through the Red Sea, and under the guiding and protecting cloud, the children of Israel were delivered and separated from their bondage and task-masters, and initiated into a new order of life; and to them in this the covenant of Moses's divine mission and commission was affirmed. Here was an affirmation of God's covenanted presence, power, and deliverance with Moses. This confirmed the people, and they "believed the Lord and his servant Moses." To look for immersion, sprinkling, or pouring in this baptizing unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea, is to degrade the whole subject, and miss its entire import. "The waters were gathered together, the floods stood upright as a heap, and the depths were congealed in the heart of the sea," and the children of Israel did "go on dry ground through the midst of the sea;" so they could not have been so

much as sprinkled or wet with spray from the sea. The pillar of cloud was not an ordinary rain-cloud. Never a drop of rain fell from that cloud. There was no water in it. Very dry indeed would be the immersion which could be obtained from that cloud.

In the execution of the plans and purposes of redemption, there is an unceasing negotiation for agreement, there is a permanent offer of amicable relations, there is a constant proposal of affianee. The Lord stipulates with men, and in covenant he engages to be a God to them, giving grace, strength, and guidance; and they engage to be his servants in all reverence and faithful obedience. In this stipulation there are provided "ordinances of divine service." Baptism has been instituted a rite of initiation, and a visible sign and seal of the righteousness to be obtained by faith through Jesus Christ. It is the token of the covenant which is made between God and the party baptized. While baptism is not regeneration, it is more than "a sign of profession, and mark of difference, whereby Christians are distinguished from others that are not baptized." It is an oath of confirmation. It is a perpetual oath of an everlasting covenant, and is not to be despised.

The meaning of the words used in the Bible to designate the sacrament of baptism has now been examined, and it is manifest that these words are too comprehensive in their meaning to be substituted by the words immersion, or dipping, or pouring, or sprinkling. Baptism is not immersion. Baptism is the sacrament by which persons are initiated into the Church of Christ, and it symbolizes the washing and purifying of the soul by the blood of Jesus. The element used in baptism is water. The rite is administered in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost.

The texts found at Romans vi. 4 and Colossians ii. 12 have been adduced in proof that only immersion is baptism. The

immersionists teach that baptism is symbolical of the death, burial, and resurrection of Christ; and in order to answer its purpose, submerging is indispensable. They claim that immersion is a real burial, and a true resurrection. To the immersionists this doctrine lends a perpetual enchantment, and they nourish it as if it were the only form of absolute truth in the Christian world. "Lost in expansion, void and infinite," must have been the imagination which formulated this chimerical theory. Originality pertains to this theory, but its originality consists in its monstrosity. The perpetuation of such a theory indicates genuine credulity. The dogma which, like this, has nothing to sustain it but limping rhymes on "the yielding wave," and "the liquid grave," should be consigned to oblivion. "The watery grave" and oblivion are not altogether dissociated.

But an investigation of the teachings of the passages of Scripture appealed to in the premises is necessary before dismissing this part of the subject. The text in the fourth verse of the sixth chapter of Romans—in order to a ready understanding thereof—must be given with its context: "Know ye not, that so many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ were baptized into his death? Therefore, we are buried with him by baptism into death; that like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life. For if we have been planted together in the likeness of his death, we shall be also in the likeness of his resurrection; knowing this, that our old man is crucified with him, that the body of sin might be destroyed, that henceforth we should not serve sin." (Rom. vi. 3-6.) Though the apostle in this passage refers to real facts, and to important transactions, and though he therein teaches real and important truths, he must not be understood as using words in this passage in a literal sense, and teaching things in a literal manner. There

are in this portion of Scripture similitudes, and it abounds with figurative terms, and is not in any degree misleading. In this text there is a richness of diction, and there is a loftiness of sentiment, which clothe it with exquisite beauty, and fill it with divine sanctity. This text is as far from teaching the literal burial of the physical man in baptism as it is from teaching the literal annihilation of the human race. It is as far from teaching the literal resurrection of the human body in baptism as it is from teaching that material things are to be endowed with immortality. If the words of one part of this passage have a literal meaning, so have the words of every portion of it. If what is mentioned in one part must have a literal performance, so must what is mentioned in every part of it. If the words "we are buried with him by baptism into death" are literal in signification, then the words "we have been planted together in the likeness of his death," and the words "our old man is crucified with him," have literal signification. If "buried with him by baptism into death" signify a literal burial of the physical body in water, and if these words contain an injunction to submerge the persons who are candidates for membership in the Church, then "planted together in the likeness of his death" signify literal planting, and enjoin the literal planting, and involve the literal germination, like planting seeds in the ground, like the growing of two stalks of wheat from the same grain, of all those who would attain Christian character. This interpretation of a literal sense involves a like application of every part of this passage of Scripture. All such interpretations, and all such attempted performances, suggest aberration and puerility. Paul never meant that those to whom he wrote had been literally crucified, and had actually died on a literal cross. When Jesus enjoined the taking up and carrying the cross, he did not make it a duty to take up and

bear about veritable pieces of wood transversely arranged. Pertinacious indeed must he be who will hold a scheme of doctrines which involves such profound absurdities as are found in this theory of burial by immersion. Those who have been "baptized into Jesus Christ" have signified their death unto sin. Their death to sin is as complete as is the death of those who have been crucified and buried. Their baptism, instead of representing the death, burial, and resurrection of Christ, is a designation, is a declaration of their own death to sin, and of their separation from their former sinful life, in which they once had pleasure. Those who have been "baptized into Jesus Christ," and "have been planted together in the likeness of his death," have union with him. Their union with Christ is as integral and intimate as that of two eions germinated from the same planting, germinated from the same grain.

The text in Colossians ii. 12, like the one at Romans vi. 4, is in its language highly figurative, as may be seen by taking with it the preceding verses which constitute a part of the sentence: "And ye are complete in him, which is the head of all principality and power; in whom also ye are circumcised with the circumcision made without hands, in putting off the body of the sins of the flesh by the circumcision of Christ; buried with him in baptism, wherein also ye are risen with him through the faith of the operation of God, who hath raised him from the dead." (Col. ii. 10-12.) Here the apostle, in exquisite figures of speech, and in striking allusion to the sacramental offices of well-known ordinances, sets forth the genuine work which is wrought in those who are made Christians. The sin inherent in fallen nature is destroyed, and a new and living principle is imparted. The old man is killed; the new man is raised up. He who has been thus wrought upon has been brought into sanctified relation to Christ, and under oath of alle-

giance to God. These, and things kindred, are the things taught in this scripture. Would as well investigate this text for a solution of the problem of perpetual motion, as appeal to it to vindicate the doctrine of immersion. The theory of immersion is without foundation in the Scriptures, and no one can question the fact that it is a sinking theory.

In the controversy about immersion the Greek prepositions have received considerable attention, and these little governing words have attained great prominence. It is contended by the immersionists that the prepositions used in the New Testament show conclusively that the persons baptized under divine sanction were put in water. They assert, with great confidence, that the prepositions used in connection with the subject show that John administered baptism in the river Jordan, not upon it, nor at it, nor by it, nor with it. And with a boldness worthy of the truth they say the prepositions $\epsilon\nu$ and $\epsilon\iota\varsigma$ mean *in*, and that they never mean *at*, *by*, or *with*, and that $\alpha\pi\omicron$ and $\epsilon\chi$ mean *out of*, and always show being in the water; and they most solemnly declare that the scholars, lexicographers, and all the translators of the original text, support these assertions. But investigation will show that the Greek prepositions, as a class of words, have more than one meaning, and that in every instance their rendering must be according to the relation they have to the other words of the sentence in which they occur, and the state or action to be denoted by the sentence. *Against, among, around, at, by, from, in, into, on, out, over, through, to, under, underneath, unto, with*, not to mention others, are English prepositions which come into requisition in giving the many meanings of the various Greek prepositions. It is contended that such expressions as the following, which are found in the Authorized Version, "were baptized of him in Jordan," "and they went down both into the water," and "went up straightway out

of the water," furnish conclusive proof of immersion. But upon investigation it will be found that these expressions, in the English text, by no means confirm the doctrine of immersion. These Greek prepositions, after all the parade made about them, are not very formidable barriers in the way of pedobaptists.

The preposition *εν* may be translated *at*. The preposition *εἰς* may be translated *to*. The preposition *απο* may be translated *from*. That these words may be thus translated shall now be proved by the immersionists themselves. They cannot reject their own work, they cannot discredit their own testimony. The proof to be introduced on the point now under consideration is found in the version of the New Testament made and published by the immersionists under the auspices of the "The American Bible Union." This version, to secure the copyright, was "entered according to act of Congress, in the year 1865, by The American Bible Union, in the Clerk's office of the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York." In a "Note" on the next page to the one giving the title, it is stated: "This revised Testament has been prepared under the auspices of the American Bible Union by the most competent scholars of the day." This version of the New Testament was made by the immersionists in the interest of their favorite dogma. These scholars of the "American Bible Union" dived into the work of making this new version for the sake of getting in immersion. A few passages may be quoted from it for the purpose of showing its animus: "In those days comes John the immerser, preaching in the wilderness of Judea. . . . Then went out to him Jerusalem, and all Judea, and all the region about the Jordan; and they were immersed by him in the Jordan, confessing their sins. . . . I indeed immerse you in water unto repentance; but he that comes after me is mightier than I,

whose sandals I am not worthy to bear; he will immerse you in the Holy Spirit and fire." (Matt. iii. 1, 5, 6, 11.)

The translations made of these Greek prepositions by this version, which so summarily disposes of the whole subject of baptism, claims immediate attention. This version renders $\epsilon\nu$ *in, among, at, with*. "In ($\epsilon\nu$) those days." (Matt. iii. 1.) "And every infirmity *among* ($\epsilon\nu$) the people." (Matt. iv. 23.) "But I shall remain *at* ($\epsilon\nu$) Ephesus until the Pentecost." (1 Cor. xvi. 8.) "But Trophimus I left *at* ($\epsilon\nu$) Miletus sick." (2 Tim. iv. 20.) "Because, though I made you sorry *with* ($\epsilon\nu$) the letter." (2 Cor. vii. 8.) This version translates $\epsilon\iota\varsigma$ *to, unto, among*. "But Tychicus I sent *to* ($\epsilon\iota\varsigma$) Ephesus." (2 Tim. iv. 12.) "And they said, *Unto* ($\epsilon\iota\varsigma$) John's immersion." (Acts xix. 3.) "But that it spread no further *among* ($\epsilon\iota\varsigma$) the people." (Acts iv. 17.) And this version translates $\alpha\pi\omicron$ *from, out*. "And having been immersed, Jesus went up immediately *from* ($\alpha\pi\omicron$) the water." (Matt. iii. 16.) "And it came to pass in those days, that Jesus came *from* ($\alpha\pi\omicron$) Nazareth of Galilee." (Mark i. 9.) "And straightway coming up *out of* ($\alpha\pi\omicron$) the water." (Mark i. 10.)

These foregoing quotations may suffice to show how these learned immersionists translate the Greek prepositions. When they have put immersion in the Bible they care nothing about the services secured to their cause by their flimsy argument about prepositions; and when baptism is out of sight they translate these prepositions, as their meaning will always bear, and as their use in different places demands, with different English prepositions. This concedes all that is contended for by those who refuse to hold the dogma of immersion.

If $\epsilon\iota\varsigma$, the preposition used in the twelfth verse of the fourth chapter of the Second Epistle to Timothy, may be translated *to*—and this is the translation made by the schol-

ars of the "American Bible Union"—then there can be no reason why the same word, εἰς, used at the thirty-eighth verse of the eighth chapter of Acts, may not be translated *to*. Then the passage would read: "And they went down both *to* the water, both Philip and the eunuch." If εν, which is the preposition used in the eighth verse of the sixteenth chapter of the First Epistle to the Corinthians, may be translated *at*—and this is the way it is translated in the version made in the interest of immersion—then there can be no reason why the same word, εν, used in the sixth verse of the third chapter of Matthew, may not be translated *at*. Then the passage would read: "And were all baptized of him *at* Jordan." If εν, which is used at the eighth verse of the seventh chapter of the Second Epistle to the Corinthians, may be translated *with*—and this is the translation made of it in this place by this version, which is so deeply absorbed in immersion—then there can be no reason why the same word, εν, found at the eleventh verse of the third chapter of Matthew, may not be translated *with*. And common sense requires that it should be *with* instead of *in*, the scholars of the "American Bible Union" to the contrary notwithstanding. But not to be further tedious: "This Revised Testament" proves every thing which those who hold that immersion is not essential to Christian baptism have contended for on the subject of the prepositions.

No specific mode is essential to the administration of the Lord's Supper, no more is any specific mode essential to the ordinance of baptism. That mode of administering baptism which best symbolizes the work of the Spirit, and which is most conducive to order, and which maintains decency and sobriety, is the mode to be adopted. If effusion is in accord with the manner of bestowing the Holy Ghost, then let effusion be the accepted mode in the use of water in inducting persons into covenant with the triune God.

Proper estimation should be attached to the sacrament of baptism. Let it not be overvalued, let it not be depreciated. Baptism is not to be administered to any individual more than once, but this baptism is a means of grace, in the use of which a Christian may live every day during his earthly pilgrimage. Symbolically baptism is a new birth, typically it is a regeneration. While washing the body with water cannot purify the conscience, and while the Holy Ghost alone can renew the soul and cleanse the heart, the words of Jesus are not empty words: "Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God." (John iii. 5.) According to the word of the Lord Jesus the Holy Ghost fell on them who were baptized with the Holy Ghost, and likewise let the water fall on those who are baptized with water.

It is essential to the ordinance of baptism that it be administered in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.

WHO ARE ENTITLED TO RECEIVE BAPTISM?

Every one entitled to salvation is entitled to baptism. This includes every man, woman, and child. Every one of human kind in all the world is entitled to the gospel of the Son of God, for it has been provided for and sent forth to every one. The apostles were sent forth by the crucified and risen Saviour to disciple, baptize, and train in the way of God's commandments all nations, every human creature. The commission given these apostles is thus broad and comprehensive. "Go ye therefore and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost; teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you; and lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world." (Matt. xxviii. 19, 20.) To disciple, baptize, and train in the commandments of God, are but distinct parts of the same work, and each

part is alike inclusive of and applicable to all human creatures. Those to be discipled are to be baptized, those to be discipled and baptized are to be taught the commandments of Jesus. Each of these works is to be done upon every one composing the nations. There is not an individual precluded. The process provided in the commission shows that the teaching, baptizing, and training are to go on in their due order, and in this order they are to go on together. The baptizing is to be done pending the training, not deferred until the training is consummated. Baptizing is in the category of the first principles. Baptizing is initial work, training in the commandments is consummative and terminal work.

A person rejecting the plan of salvation cannot, of course, enter into its covenant stipulations. It would be preposterous for a man with a profane speech on his lips to take an oath of allegiance to the King immutable. The man who receives baptism must recognize the scheme of redemption and the obligations of obedience to its requisitions. The man who assumes the vows of the baptismal covenant assumes the obligations of repentance for sin, of faith in Jesus Christ, and of obedience to the law of God. The man's desires and purposes should be in accord with his actions. The adult person who is in conformity to this standard is entitled to receive baptism. The penitent who is seeking to be saved from his sins, who is seeking the regenerating power of the Holy Ghost, may receive baptism as he may receive any other assistance, and as he may use any other means of grace which the gospel offers him. In this view is seen the true meaning of the text: "Repent, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost." (Acts ii. 38.) The Bible no more defers baptism until after the attainment

of regeneration than it defers prayer until after that attainment.

INFANTS are entitled to receive baptism. Children under parental authority may be dedicated to God and his service in holy baptism. The position herein stated is assumed with confidence; not the confidence which is born of credulity, or preconceptions, or predilections, but with the confidence which is inspired by the inflexible word of God. With reliance placed alone in truth, appeal is made to the Scriptures. The evidence to support the position that infants are entitled to receive baptism may be further unfolded.

In every covenant which God made with men, in which he instituted a covenant-making and a covenant-keeping ordinance, he included, by special stipulation, the children of the parties with whom the covenant was made. This fact attests that children are entitled to receive baptism.

God made a covenant with Adam, in the days of his innocency, of which covenant the tree of life in the midst of the garden of Eden was the token. This covenant included, by special designation, Adam's posterity: "So God created man in his own image, in the image of God created he him; male and female created he them. And God blessed them, and God said unto them, Be fruitful, and multiply, and replenish the earth, and subdue it; and have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over every living thing that moveth upon the earth." (Gen. i. 27, 28.)

When the flood was past, and the Lord smelled a sweet savor from the burnt-offerings presented to him by Noah, God blessed Noah and his sons, and he made with them a covenant, of which covenant the bow in the clouds was ordained the token. This covenant included, by special stipulation, their children: "And God spake unto Noah, and to his sons with him, saying, And I, behold, I establish my

covenant with you, and with your seed after you; and with every living creature that is with you, of the fowl, of the cattle, and of every beast of the earth with you; from all that go out of the ark, to every beast of the earth. And I will establish my covenant with you; neither shall all flesh be cut off any more by the waters of a flood; neither shall there any more be a flood to destroy the earth. And God said, This is the token of the covenant which I make between me and you, and every living creature that is with you, for perpetual generations: I do set my bow in the cloud, and it shall be for a token of a covenant between me and the earth." (Gen. ix. 8-13.)

In the roll of years and in the lapse of time God called Abraham, and made with him a covenant, of which covenant circumcision was instituted the token. In this, as in the former covenants noticed, the children were specially named: "And God said unto Abraham, Thou shalt keep my covenant therefore, thou, and thy seed after thee in their generations. This is my covenant, which ye shall keep, between me and you, and thy seed after thee: Every man-child among you shall be circumcised. And ye shall circumcise the flesh of your foreskin; and it shall be a token of the covenant betwixt me and you. And he that is eight days old shall be circumcised among you, every man-child in your generations, he that is born in the house, or bought with money of any stranger, which is not of thy seed." (Gen. xvii. 9-12.)

When the fullness of time in the great purpose of universal redemption was come, Jesus came forth and made a covenant with the nations of the world, of which covenant baptism was ordained the token. In this covenant Jesus specially named and included the children: "Then were there brought unto him little children, that he should put his hands on them, and pray; and the disciples rebuked

them. But Jesus said, Suffer little children, and forbid them not, to come unto me; for of such is the kingdom of heaven. And he laid his hands on them, and departed thence." (Matt. xix. 13-15.) When the apostles went forth to proclaim this covenant of the Son of God, which covenant is not to be superseded so long as the ages endure, they made special mention of the children as embraced in the promise and included in the covenant: "Then Peter said unto them, Repent, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost. For the promise is unto you, and to your children, and to all that are afar off, even as many as the Lord our God shall call." (Acts ii. 38, 39.) That the children are included in the promise is mentioned in immediate connection with the ordinance of baptism.

If God's purpose and grace are manifested in his covenant transactions—and most certainly they are—then it is the divine purpose to guarantee to children the promise of covenant grace, and to have them inducted into his Church by holy baptism. Surely the God of eternal truth and love would not so uniformly have included the children in his covenant engagements were it his purpose to exclude them from the ordinance of baptism. These conclusions are apparent to any one of ordinary sagacity. This testimony, gathered from the stipulations of God's repeated covenants to the rights of children in the economy of the gospel, cannot be impeached, and the conclusion that infants should be baptized rests on scriptural premises. The wise, candid, and tractable will submit to evidence and accept demonstrated truth.

In conformity to and in recognition of the covenant stipulations of Jesus that little children, infants, should be initiated as subjects of his kingdom, the apostles baptized the children of those who accepted the gospel and brought

their children for the reception of the ordinance. Lydia, of Thyatira, the jailer at Philippi, and Stephanas at Corinth, are all mentioned as having their children baptized. "And a certain woman named Lydia, a seller of purple, of the city of Thyatira, which worshiped God, heard us; whose heart the Lord opened, that she attended unto the things which were spoken of Paul. And when she was baptized, and her household, she besought us, saying, If ye have judged me to be faithful to the Lord, come into my house, and abide there; and she constrained us. . . . And he took them the same hour of the night, and washed their stripes; and was baptized, he and all his, straightway." (Acts xvi. 14, 15, 33.) "And I baptized also the household of Stephanas." (1 Cor. i. 16.) Had it been a fact that only adult persons, the servants, or domestics, of Lydia, the jailer, and Stephanas, had been baptized, the record could have been conformed to the fact without the least difficulty. It could have been stated that the stewards, or hired servants, or under-officers, of the parties named were baptized. But in each case the historical statement suggests that the children of these families were baptized. The jailer "was baptized, he and all his." "His" were persons under his control and authority—persons for whom he acted. Lydia "was baptized, and her household." "Her household" were persons under her control and authority—persons for whom she acted.

One of the objections which the Baptists offer to baptizing infants, and which they enforce with the bluster of confidence and with an air of triumph, they state as follows: *Baptism cannot save an infant. An infant dying without baptism would not, on that account, be lost. Why, then, baptize an infant? What good can baptism do an unconscious infant?*

This objection must be fairly considered. No properly

conducted investigation could possibly lead to the association of the statements and questions embodied in this objection. They have no relation to each other whatever. No sublime thought could ever suggest such a combination of disconnected points. To dispose of this objection to the satisfaction of any thinking mind is not a difficult task, for it is really a frivolous objection. The reasoning presented in this objection would discard the ordinance of baptism altogether. It would do away with baptizing adults as well as infants. It is granted at once that baptism, by itself, cannot save an infant. It is conceded that an infant dying without baptism would not, on that account, be lost. It does not, however, follow from this that there is not a sufficient reason for baptizing an infant. It does not follow from this that baptism cannot do an unconscious infant any good. Baptism, by itself, cannot save an adult. An adult dying without baptism would not, on that account, be lost. So, then, to meet the Baptists on their own ground, Why baptize an adult? what good can baptism do an adult? When the Baptists have answered these questions properly, then they will have proper answers to the questions, Why baptize an infant? what good can baptism do an unconscious infant? In the meantime two other questions may be propounded: Why, under a former economy, circumcise an infant? what good could circumcision do an unconscious infant? The answer to these questions will supply the answer to the questions, Why baptize an infant? what good can baptism do an unconscious infant? The reason for circumcising an infant, under a former economy, is the reason for baptizing an infant under the present economy. As benefits were conferred on an infant by circumcision, in like manner benefits are conferred on an infant by baptism. This disposes of the objection so boastingly preferred against baptizing children.

By the Baptists it is said infants should not be baptized because they have not the intelligence to comprehend the nature of the ordinance, nor the faith necessary to secure its benefits, nor power sufficient to render the obedience required by the divine law. All the objections herein contained have been satisfactorily answered by what has been said in refuting the objection above noticed.

The nations are to be baptized. Infants constitute an essential part of the nations. They are regarded, protected, and provided for as citizens of the commonwealth; therefore, they are part of the population entitled to receive the ordinance of baptism. To attempt to refute this position is to expend labor in vain, and strength for naught. How lovely and how beautiful the ordinance which initiates the children into the Church of God on earth! Hither come the tribes which swell the ranks of Israel's hosts. By divine statute the ministers of the gospel are authorized to baptize infants. Ministers, overseers of the flock, are to take into the fold the lambs, and feed them and nurture them. "Feed my lambs."

THE LORD'S SUPPER,

sometimes called the Eucharist, was instituted in the city of Jerusalem by the Lord Jesus, while eating, with his twelve apostles, the passover supper at the feast of unleavened bread, the night in which he was betrayed. The persons present and receiving this sacrament, at the time of its institution, were the twelve apostles; perhaps Judas Iscariot was excluded. Bread and wine, the elements employed in instituting this sacrament, were used with a service of thanksgiving, and with a special formula of words. The elements and words of institution give to this ordinance a visible sign and ceremony ordained of God which constitute it a sacrament. This is a sacrament, a covenant ordinance. It is a memorial of redemption, a pledge of the

resurrection of the dead, and of a blissful immortality. Having a prescribed form and a visible sign, it is a seal of the covenant of redemption. It is absolutely essential to this ordinance that it set forth the death of Christ, and perpetuate the doctrine of redemption and remission through his death. A recognition of the atoning merit and of the divine efficacy of the death of Christ, in securing the forgiveness of sins, is essential to the validity of this service. Bread and wine are also indispensable to this ordinance. It must be administered in the use of bread and wine, and in the use of the form of words setting forth to view the broken body and shed blood of Christ for the redemption of men and the remission of their sins. This sacrament is administered to confirm in the covenant of redemption, and to strengthen in the grace of remission, those who receive it. It is to be administered and received repeatedly, to keep the death of Christ as a sacrifice for sin visibly present to his people, and to furnish them constantly the nourishment which, as a memorial of his propitiation, it is competent to supply. While it does not convey grace by its own operation, and while it is not a sacrifice, made by priestly manipulations, for completing the atoning sacrifice of Christ made on the cross, it is something more than an ordinary service for commemorating historical events, and for producing good resolutions and moral effects. To all such as eat and drink according to the meaning and intent of this divine institution, Christ is spiritually present in this sacrament. To such as in this sacrament show forth the death of Christ as a sacrifice for sin, there is a partaking of the benefits of that sacrificial death, there is a partaking spiritually of the body and blood of Christ, and there is a reception of strength, and health, and life.

The doctrine of transubstantiation is contrary to philosophy, to common sense, and to the Scriptures. It is not

true that the bread and wine are converted into the real body and blood of Christ, by the words of consecration used by the priest. That which is received by the communicant, in the sacrament, is not the body which was born of the Virgin Mary, offered on the cross, and received up into heaven. This body is in heaven, and not on the earth; and is impassible, and cannot be divided, masticated, or digested. Though they have been set forth by the friends of the doctrine as conclusive proof thereof, the words of Jesus used at the time of the institution of this sacrament do not establish the doctrine of transubstantiation: "And as they were eating, Jesus took bread, and blessed it, and brake it, and gave it to the disciples, and said, Take, eat; this is my body. And he took the cup, and gave thanks, and gave it to them, saying, Drink ye all of it; for this is my blood of the new testament, which is shed for many for the remission of sins." (Matt. xxvi. 26-28.) In these words, Jesus said what he meant, and meant what he said, but evidently he did not intend that the disciples should understand that in eating the bread they were actually eating his literal body, and that in drinking the wine, which was in the cup, they were literally drinking his real blood. They could not possibly entertain such a thought on the subject. His body was there before their eyes, whole, and unmangled; his blood was in his veins, not yet spilt. They knew they were not eating his literal flesh; they knew they were not drinking his real blood. They were clearly to understand him, and they did understand him, as speaking of these, the bread and wine, which they ate and drank, as pointing to his broken body and shed blood; which body was to be broken, and which blood was to be shed for the remission of sins. The disciples were prepared, so far as they could be prepared under the circumstances, to comprehend the Lord's meaning in his

words, and in the entire institution, for he had taught them before his betrayal, and before this hour's service, that he was to give his flesh for the life of the world, and that men were to obtain life through his flesh torn, and through his blood shed: "I am the living bread which came down from heaven; if any man eat of this bread, he shall live forever; and the bread that I will give is my flesh, which I will give for the life of the world. The Jews therefore strove among themselves, saying, How can this man give us his flesh to eat? Then Jesus said unto them, Verily, verily, I say unto you, Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood, ye have no life in you. Whoso eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, hath eternal life; and I will raise him up at the last day. For my flesh is meat indeed, and my blood is drink indeed. He that eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, dwelleth in me, and I in him." (John vi. 51-56.) It is literally true that whosoever is saved, is saved by eating the flesh and drinking the blood of the Son of man. There is no salvation, there is no eternal life, without this eating and this drinking. The man must be fed and nourished by the life-giving nourishment provided by the sacrifice of the crucified Jesus, if he would live forever. But it is not material bread, nor material drink, that is here spoken of; it is not a literal eating of the flesh, nor a literal drinking of the blood, of the Lord Jesus. It is meat and drink for spiritual nourishment, taken in spiritually. It is true that it is not figurative meat and drink of which the Lord here speaks, but it is the nourishing and life-giving virtue of his atoning sacrifice, made through his flesh torn and his blood shed, of which he speaks under the figures of meat and drink. Though they are used to set forth a real life-giving virtue in the atoning death of the Son of God, these words, recorded in the sixth chapter of John, are highly figurative.

He who eats the flesh, and drinks the blood of Christ—as Christ sets this eating and drinking forth in this sixth chapter of John—obtains eternal life; but one might eat the bread and drink the wine, in the sacrament, and still have no life in him. Many partake of the Lord's Supper who are not saved. In many cases where the Lord's Supper has been received there has been no change of heart, no feeding upon Christ by faith, and there is no consistency of conduct. This could not be, if in the eating the bread and drinking the wine used in the Lord's Supper the literal flesh and blood of Christ were received. Those who are saved must receive the benefit of Christ's body broken and of his blood shed. The words of Jesus used in the institution of this sacrament are qualified by the figurative sense, and they must be taken in the figurative, and not in the literal, sense. No doubt the paschal lamb was a type of Christ, and the blood of atonement presented in the Jewish sacrifices pointed to the blood of Christ by which men are redeemed, and so they were understood; and in this view the words of Jesus had their significance. As words are used in many places they will not bear a figurative sense, and as they are used in many other places they will not bear a literal sense. This must be recognized, and interpretations must be governed accordingly. "And Moses was a hundred and twenty years old when he died; his eye was not dim, nor his natural force abated." (Deut. xxxiv.*7.) This language is literal in its signification, without any typical meaning or figurative intent. It would be folly to treat it as figurative language. "I am the rose of Sharon, and the lily of the valleys." (Song of Solomon ii. 1.) This language is manifestly figurative, and could not have a literal interpretation. Likewise, the words used in the institution of the Lord's Supper are figurative, and in their plain and obvious meaning must be understood as teaching that the

bread and wine are signs of Christ's broken body and shed blood. The bread is eaten and the wine is drank in commemoration of Christ's death. In many places Christ's words must be understood figuratively. As in the following texts: "Verily, verily, I say unto you, I am the door of the sheep." (John x. 7.) "I am the true vine, and my Father is the husbandman. I am the vine, ye are the branches." (John xv. 1, 5.) In like manner the words of this institution are figurative, and they mean: this bread represents my body given, broken; this cup, this wine, represents my blood shed. The Scriptures abound with instances in which the sign is spoken of as the thing signified. Two instances may be given. Christ says: "The seed is the word of God." (Luke viii. 11.) The apostle Paul says: "And that Rock was Christ." (1 Cor. x. 4.) The bread and wine are sacramental signs, not an outward veil having an inward divine substance. After all the manipulations of consecration, the bread and wine have not been converted into any other substance, either human or divine; they are bread and wine still, having the form, color, taste, and substance of bread and wine. The rhetoric about only the "accidents" of bread and wine remaining is but a silly parade, and can never support a theory which defies common sense, and contradicts the Bible.

The doctrine of consubstantiation is as unreasonable and as unscriptural as the doctrine of transubstantiation, for which it was substituted. Neither by type, figure, sign, illustration, nor in any manner, does the Bible give any intimation that the veritable body of Christ is really present with the bread and wine used in the administration of the Eucharist. Such a thing is absolutely impossible. The body of Christ can be in but one place at the same time. His veritable body was literally present at the institution of this sacrament, but has never been pres-

ent at any administration of it since that time. The Eucharist is administered in very many places at the same hour. It is impossible, in the very nature of physical being, for the body of Christ to be literally present at all these places. And, moreover, Christ's body is in heaven, and not on the earth. "He ascended into heaven, and sitteth at the right-hand of God the Father Almighty; from thence he shall come to judge the quick and the dead." This doctrine of consubstantiation contravenes the absolute laws of material being, antagonizes the teachings of what is called the Apostles' Creed, and impinges the word of God. The Bible teaches that he who rightly takes the bread and wine has communicated to him the benefits of the body and blood of Christ, the bread and wine constituting the outward sign, signifying the reception of the body and blood of Christ spiritually. This is concisely set forth in the words of St. Paul: "The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not the communion of the blood of Christ? The bread which we break, is it not the communion of the body of Christ?" (1 Cor. x. 16.)

WHO ARE ENTITLED TO RECEIVE THE LORD'S SUPPER? The nature and purpose of the death of Christ and the nature and purpose of this sacrament furnish an answer to this question. Christ died for sinners. He died to atone for their sins, that they through his atoning sacrifice might obtain remission of their sins, and whatever else pertains to salvation and eternal life. This sacrament he ordained "his death-recording rite," as Charles Wesley, the poet, in one of his admirable hymns, calls it. Christ says: "This is my blood of the new testament, which is shed for many for the remission of sins." Consequently, sinners are interested in this sacrament, and sinners are entitled to receive it. Sinners, not the innocent—sinners, not angels—are invited to commemorate the death of the Lord Jesus. If

there be those who have never had sins to be remitted, let them stand aloof from this sacrament, which has all its significance in its portrayal of the broken body and shed blood of Christ for the remission of sins. It must, however, be penitent and repentant sinners who commemorate, through this sacrament, the atoning death of the Son of man. Sinners who justify their sins, sinners who crucify the Son of God afresh by contemning his commandments, cannot rightfully nor rightly receive the bread and wine in this divine service. But sinners who honor Christ by confessing him with the mouth, and who renounce their sins, and who seek, through the atoning death of Jesus, the remission of their sins, may eat and drink with thanksgiving, and to their profit and edification.

It has been asserted by some that regeneration must precede participation in this sacrament, and that penitent inquirers are not to be admitted to any participation in this sacred ordinance. But not a single passage from the Scriptures can be given which will in any wise support this assertion. Regenerated persons may and should participate in this service, and so may truly penitent seekers.

It has been asserted also that baptism must precede participation in this sacred ordinance. But this assertion, so confidently made, is also without any warrant of Scripture. Nowhere in the Bible is it asserted that the reception of baptism must absolutely precede the reception of the Eucharist. Baptism is not an indispensable prerequisite to the Lord's Supper, any more than the Lord's Supper is an indispensable prerequisite to baptism. It is true that baptism is the initiatory rite in the Church, and it is true that baptism should be administered to infants, and these two points may furnish an apparent basis for the inference that the reception of baptism should precede the reception of the Eucharist, but it is certainly correct to say that the same moral

qualities and attainments which fit a person for the reception of one of these sacraments fit him for the reception of the other. One sacrament is not more sacred than the other. If a person presenting himself at the table for the Eucharist should be rejected for want of qualification, he should, for the same disqualification, be rejected were he to present himself at the font for baptism. He should no more be refused the Lord's Supper because he had not been baptized than he should be refused baptism because he had not received the Eucharist. Any one refusing to recognize baptism as a sacrament of the Church should not, of course, be permitted to receive the Eucharist; and, on the other hand, any one refusing to recognize the Eucharist as a sacrament of the Church should not be permitted to receive baptism.

Repentance and confession of sin, the purpose to lead a new life, and a trustful recognition of the atoning death of Jesus, are necessary to a proper and profitable participation in the holy communion. To this end the candidate for this service should scrutinize his life, his motives, and his heart. "But let a man examine himself, and so let him eat of that bread, and drink of that cup." (1 Cor. xi. 28.) It is required by the Bible that the duty of maintaining moral character be accepted by those who would continue to show forth the Lord's death by participating in the Lord's Supper. "But now I have written unto you not to keep company, if any man that is called a brother be a fornicator, or covetous, or an idolater, or a railer, or a drunkard, or an extortioner; with such a one no not to eat." (1 Cor. v. 11.)

It is legitimate and altogether appropriate to administer the Eucharist at any time and place that the elements of bread and wine can be furnished, and a proper administrator and a proper communicant can be found together. The num-

ber of communicants assembled for this service is a matter of entire indifference. It is as legitimate to administer this ordinance to one communicant as it is to administer it to one hundred. Any place where God may be worshiped is appropriate. Whether it is in a public hall or a private room makes no difference. This sacrament was instituted in a large upper-room of a private dwelling. This is recorded by three of the evangelists. To administer this sacrament in a private house to an invalid impinges no divine statute. The Church, in her enactments and administrations, should be careful that in avoiding errors and superstitions of one kind she does not run into those of another sort which are equally hurtful.

The posture assumed at the Lord's Supper is of no vital importance, whether it be kneeling, standing, or sitting. Whether it is the intention of the eucharistic services to express joy, or humility, or penitence, or gratitude, the posture assumed is of no consequence whatever. Error is as likely to be fostered by one posture as by another. Than attachment to the posture of sitting there is none more indicative of prejudice and unreasonable adherence to mere precedent.

We see the blood that seals our peace;
Thy pard'ning mercy we receive;
The bread doth visibly express
The strength through which our spirits live.

CHAPTER XV.

THE PERSONAL CHRISTIAN LIFE TERMINATING IN THE
FINAL REWARDS OF SALVATION.

ENTITY, individuality, responsibility, probation, contingency, doom, and destiny. What words are these! What thoughts, sublime and fearful, they embody! The time allotted to each individual on earth is a time of probation, and the present life and the probation thereof are to terminate by entrance upon a future state and a final destiny. All the days allotted on earth are days of probation and responsibility, of labor and trial. Each individual is charged with working out his own salvation, and his destiny depends upon the fidelity with which he responds to the task assigned. There are doctrines to be believed, principles to be cherished, and work to be done. Salvation is to be achieved. Individual responsibility is a fearful reality. "For it is written, As I live, saith the Lord, every knee shall bow to me, and every tongue shall confess to God. So then every one of us shall give account of himself to God." (Rom. xiv. 11, 12.) There is a personal Christian life to be maintained on earth; a Christian life which, when maintained to the end of the pilgrimage, terminates in the rewards of an endless felicity. The individual is furnished here with the means of grace necessary to every good word and work. Mind, heart, and hand, time, talent, and opportunity, are all to be used in the service of God.

The testimonies of God are to be sought, his judgments learned, his precepts and his statutes kept, and his law and

his commandments obeyed. The word of God has been spoken to men; it is pure, true, and mighty, and shall stand forever. It should not be corrupted, nor handled deceitfully. "All Scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness; that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works." (2 Tim. iii. 16, 17.)

Man is dependent upon revelation for a knowledge of God and of himself. The light of nature is circumscribed in its range, and is dim even where it shines. Some subjects lie beyond its range, and those lying within its limits are imperfectly illuminated. Human reason, unaided by revelation, cannot range, in its meditations and reflections, beyond the limits of the light of nature. The conclusions arrived at by human reason have not been uniform, and the rules adopted for human action by those who have had no other source of knowledge but human reason have been imperfect at best, and most generally absurd and contradictory. The voice of conscience is not uniform. Human reason, having no other source of information but nature, could never discover the origin of things nor find out the destiny of man beyond the hour of his dissolution. No human intuition ever evolved the idea of the resurrection of the dead, or disclosed the existence of angels. Divine revelation brought to human view the origin of life, and the origin of all things, and the doctrine of the resurrection and immortality. Man did not search for God and find him. God made himself known to man, made himself known by revelation.

The Bible is a supernatural and an infallible composition. It is the word of God spoken to man. It is a revelation of the divine will and purpose concerning the human family. The writers of the Bible were inspired. God,

by this inspiration, suggested every thought expressed, indited every word used, and guided in the entire treatment of every theme set forth. "But the Comforter, which is the Holy Ghost, whom the Father will send in my name, he shall teach you all things, and bring all things to your remembrance, whatsoever I have said unto you." (John xiv. 26.) "We have also a more sure word of prophecy; whereunto ye do well that ye take heed, as unto a light that shineth in a dark place, until the day dawn, and the day-star arise in your hearts; knowing this first, that no prophecy of the Scripture is of any private interpretation. For the prophecy came not in old time by the will of man; but holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost." (2 Pet. i. 19-21.)

Though given through different writers, and in different times and separate ages of the world, there is in the several parts of the Bible perfect agreement. This agreement shows that the book has one author, and that he is possessed of divine wisdom. The loftiness of the style and the dignity of the sentiments of this book show it to be divine. It contains no ostentatious phraseology and pronounces no boastful eulogies. It exhibits primal beauties, records imperishable truths, embodies the greatest mysteries, portrays the profoundest wonders, and inculcates the sublimest principles. This book displays the infinite wisdom, love, justice, and goodness of God. The hideousness of sin and the beauty of holiness are alike depicted in these divine pages. Here sin is denounced and virtue is approved. Redemption, deepest and sublimest of all mysteries, is the theme pervading the history, precept, prophecy, and promise of this book. The Bible shows to its readers the avenues of happiness, and whether it fills them with calm repose or with rapturous joy, it leads them on to ever new delights. It sheds a realizing light, and the invisible, the immortal, the

eternal One is apprehended. All things in "the breadth and length, and depth and height," are brought to view here, and the revelation is complete, so that none may preach any other gospel, for there is not another. "For I testify unto every man that heareth the words of the prophecy of this book, If any man shall add unto these things, God shall add unto him the plagues that are written in this book; and if any man shall take away from the words of the book of this prophecy, God shall take away his part out of the book of life, and out of the holy city, and from the things which are written in this book." (Rev. xxii. 18, 19.)

The truth and the divinity of the Scriptures have been attested by the power of miracles and by the wisdom of prophecy. In connection with the promulgation of the Scriptures miracles were wrought, miracles which were attested as genuine by credible and competent witnesses. Prophecies were delivered in conjunction with these messages from the omniscient God which have been fulfilled; and their utterance as prophecies, and their subsequent fulfillment have been established by most satisfactory evidence. It is a resort to a poor expedient to say that it is contrary to experience that miracles should be true, and according to experience that testimony should be false. This has no force in it at all. It is simply to deny the existence of supernatural power, and to charge those who have testified to miracles with deception, and an intentional violation of the truth. In the very nature of the case there can be no universal experience on the subject of miracles. If miracles were sufficiently frequent to afford universal experience, if they were as common as the recurrence of day and night, or the flowing of water, or the blowing of the wind, then they would be no longer discernible as miracles, and would fail of their effect and of their purpose. The power of

miracles has never been discovered in nature, and never will be, but it does not follow that there is no supernatural power residing in a being distinct from the material world. No one believing the Scriptures has ever claimed that the power of miracles resides in material things. They believe that the power of miracles is with the immaterial and omnipotent God. The remark that it is according to experience that testimony should be false, cannot discredit miracles, and cannot discredit testimony. Because some witnesses have prevaricated, it does not follow that all testimony is and must be false. The men who at different times testified to the different miracles which were wrought by and through God, were competent to judge of the facts in the case, and were in every way competent witnesses. They were not persons of blind credulity, who could be imposed on by necromancy, sleight-of-hand, and cunning craftiness. Moses, under God, enacted laws against witchcraft, and against all superstitious charms; and this shows that he was not a man giving countenance to and living by such things. Moses was not a man to be deceived by appearances, and so of all the witnesses to the miracles asserted by the Scriptures to be such. The apostles and disciples of Jesus were not persons led by blind credulity, deceiving and being deceived, the dupes of every story told. They would not believe that Christ was risen from the dead until they had indubitable evidence. And so of all truth-loving men.

After strict and elaborate investigation, it does not appear to the contrary but that the Bible presents a system of truth consistent with itself, and in harmony with all nature's works; a system of truth adapted to the necessities and capacities of mankind, and a system of truth creditable to a benevolent and an omniscient and infallible author. The Bible reveals the relations which all moral beings, including God himself, sustain to each other, and designates

all human rights, and appoints and instructs in all human duties. "The Bible contains all things necessary to man's salvation," is the true standard of faith, the sole rule of conduct, and the only authority in the establishment and enforcement of doctrine. The obligation to submit implicitly to the teachings, and to observe to do all the words of this law which are written in this book, is absolute. The Christian is to grow, become wise and strong, stable and good, by the constant study of the Scriptures. Therein is the way of success and prosperity, of light and life. "Ye shall not add unto the word which I command you, neither shall ye diminish aught from it, that ye may keep the commandments of the Lord your God, which I command you." (Deut. iv. 2.) "And he said unto him, If they hear not Moses and the prophets, neither will they be persuaded, though one rose from the dead." (Luke xvi. 31.) "For I testify unto every man that heareth the words of the prophecy of this book, if any man shall add unto these things, God shall add unto him the plagues that are written in this book; and if any man shall take away from the words of the book of this prophecy, God shall take away his part out of the book of life, and out of the holy city, and from the things which are written in this book." (Rev. xxii. 18, 19.) "The law of the Lord is perfect, converting the soul; the testimony of the Lord is sure, making wise the simple. The statutes of the Lord are right, rejoicing the heart; the commandment of the Lord is pure, enlightening the eyes. The fear of the Lord is clean, enduring forever; the judgments of the Lord are true and righteous altogether. More to be desired are they than gold, yea, than much fine gold; sweeter also than honey and the honey-comb. Moreover, by them is thy servant warned; and in keeping of them there is great reward." (Ps. xix. 7-11.) "Search the Scriptures; for in them ye think ye have eternal life;

and they are they which testify of me." (John v. 39.) "We have also a more sure word of propheey; whereunto ye do well that ye take heed, as unto a light that shineth in a dark place, until the day dawn, and the day-star arise in your hearts; knowing this first, that no propheey of the Scripture is of any private interpretation." (2 Pet. i. 19, 20.)

Whosoever would lay hold on eternal life, and would be partaker of the inheritance of the saints in light, must hold fast the form of sound words; must show by a good conversation works of meekness and of wisdom; must be an example of patience in suffering affliction and persecutions; and must continually seek to be strengthened with might by the Divine Spirit in the inner man. The Christian is to be a witness for Jesus, an embodiment of prudence and piety, an agent in disseminating truth and holiness, in maintaining justice and judgment, and an instrument in reforming and saving sinners; and for the work thus wrought in the earth he is to be rewarded in the world of glory and of renown. "Ye are the salt of the earth. Ye are the light of the world." (Matt. v. 13, 14.) "Ye shall be witnesses unto me both in Jerusalem, and in all Judea, and in Samaria, and unto the uttermost part of the earth." (Acts i. 8.) "And they that be wise shall shine as the brightness of the firmament; and they that turn many to righteousness, as the stars forever and ever." (Dan. xii. 3.) "Let him know, that he which converteth the sinner from the error of his way shall save a soul from death, and shall hide a multitude of sins." (James v. 20.)

The things which pertain to Christians are within the realm of the supernatural, the invisible, and the future. Faith alone is sufficient to take in these. Hence Christians never depend on the science of nature, the vagaries of human reason, or the things visible and tangible. They

walk by faith, and not by sight, and are saved by hope. The things which are seen being temporal, and the things which are not seen being eternal, they look not at the things which are seen, but at the things which are not seen. While in the flesh, they do always groan, most earnestly desiring to put off their earthly house, and to put on their house which is to be furnished them from heaven. They continually declare that they are strangers and pilgrims in the earth, and that they seek a city which God has prepared for them, with enduring foundations, in another and better country. This faith, by which Christians walk, "is the substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen." This faith gives a realizing sense and a substantiating evidence of the invisible things for which they hope. This is not an assumption of blind credulity, supported only by superstitious fervor, but it is an intelligent assurance founded upon a conscious perception of the supernatural, the invisible, and the eternal. The supernatural has been displayed by wonders and prophecies. Wonder-working power and prophetic knowledge declare the existence of the invisible, omnipotent, and omniscient God. Faith, transcending the power and range of reason, grasps the eternal and the infinite, and hope anchors the soul steadfastly where heaven is continually in view.

In his Epistle to the Romans, the apostle Paul announces as a divine truth, that salvation is attained by hope: "For we are saved by hope." (Rom. viii. 24.) While giving to the subject of hope all the importance which can rightfully attach to it, let no other doctrine be ignored. Let the substitution of one doctrine for another have no place in theory or practice. Let no point of doctrine be disparaged, let none be unduly magnified. Grace, atonement, repentance, faith, justification, regeneration, assurance, love, and obedience, are all included in the teachings of the gospel.

Every one of these doctrines has its own peculiar functions, and, in the great system of salvation, is assigned its own peculiar place. Not a single doctrine of the Bible conflicts with any other doctrine thereof. Not a text in the Scriptures antagonizes any other text therein. The text, "By grace are ye saved, through faith," does not impinge the text, "We are saved by hope." The text, "Therefore, we conclude that a man is justified by faith without the deeds of the law," does not contravene the text, "Work out your own salvation with fear and trembling." In the attainment of the salvation of men, grace and hope are both productive elements, but they are by no means the same thing. Faith and hope are closely associated, and they have something in common; but faith is not hope, and hope is not faith. By the grace of God, through the death of Jesus Christ, salvation has been provided for the human race, and this grace which brings salvation, and which has appeared to all men, must ever be magnified; yet men are not justified by grace, and grace does not perform the office which is peculiar to hope, nor the office which is peculiar to faith. Repentance, in its place, is indispensable in the salvation of responsible sinners; but men are not justified by repentance. Regeneration is a work without which no one can be saved, but it is distinct, both in its nature and office, from hope, and can never be substituted thereby.

To the Christian who still resides here, salvation is not already attained. If salvation were a state already confirmed, then hope could not be a medium in conferring it.

Probation lasts as long as this present life, and the final destiny of every man is contingent while he resides in a mortal body. To all who dwell below the sun salvation is something not yet secured. The Christian does not attain the end of his faith while he remains in the flesh on the earth. Salvation is never consummated, and, in the

very nature of the case, cannot be consummated, this side of the grave. This life is one of vanity and suffering, and a finished salvation is a state of freedom from all pain, suffering, and death. A complete salvation gives to both body and soul fullness of glory, a glory secure beyond all death and contingency. So the subject is presented by the following text: "For I reckon that the sufferings of this present time are not worthy to be compared with the glory which shall be revealed in us. For the earnest expectation of the creature waiteth for the manifestation of the sons of God. For the creature was made subject to vanity, not willingly, but by reason of him who hath subjected the same in hope; because the creature itself also shall be delivered from the bondage of corruption into the glorious liberty of the children of God. For we know that the whole creation groaneth and travaileth in pain together until now. And not only they, but ourselves also, which have the first-fruits of the Spirit, even we ourselves groan within ourselves, waiting for the adoption, to wit, the redemption of our body. For we are saved by hope; but hope that is seen is not hope: for what a man seeth, why doth he yet hope for? But if we hope for that we see not, then do we with patience wait for it." (Rom. viii. 18-25.)

It is absolutely possible for a justified and regenerated person to sin, and thereby apostatize from a state of grace, and be finally lost. He may apostatize and be as surely and irretrievably lost as he who was never justified and regenerated. Many passages might be adduced from the Bible in proof of this position, but the subject is so plain, and the demonstration is so complete, that a few passages may suffice. "But when the righteous turneth away from his righteousness, and committeth iniquity, and doeth according to all the abominations that the wicked man doeth, shall he live? All his righteousness that he hath done shall not

be mentioned; in his trespass that he hath trespassed, and in his sin that he hath sinned, in them shall he die. . . . When a righteous man turneth away from his righteousness, and committeth iniquity, and dieth in them; for his iniquity that he hath done shall he die." (Ezek. xviii. 24, 26.) "The righteousness of the righteous shall not deliver him in the day of his transgression; as for the wickedness of the wicked, he shall not fall thereby in the day that he turneth from his wickedness; neither shall the righteous be able to live for his righteousness in the day that he sinneth. When I shall say to the righteous that he shall surely live; if he trust to his own righteousness, and commit iniquity, all his righteousness shall not be remembered; but for his iniquity that he hath committed, he shall die for it." (Ezek. xxxiii. 12, 13.) These texts present and portray a possible apostasy, complete and ruinous. Righteous men may abandon their righteousness, annul their former good works, forfeit their state of acceptance and approval, and reduce themselves to a state of abominable wickedness and absolute condemnation. They may lose not only the outward signs of righteousness, but they may lose all the internal principles thereof, and they may become altogether abominable. Though righteous, and accepted, they may become in every respect—in relation, in heart, and in life—just like those who were never any other-wise than wicked and condemned. As trees of righteousness they may lose not only the leaves of profession, but they may become "trees whose fruit withereth, without fruit, twice dead, plucked up by the roots." When the righteous turn away from their righteousness, and commit sin, they thereby abrogate all their good, forfeit their justification, and vitiate their title to an inheritance in heaven. This doctrine is forcibly set forth by Jesus in the parable of the debtor. The indebtedness was forgiven the debtor by

his lord, but when the lord of the debtor heard of his overbearing exaction in dealing with others, he revived the debt, and required the man to pay it in full—the same as though it had never been forgiven. Christ says: “So likewise shall my heavenly Father do also unto you, if ye from your hearts forgive not every one his brother their trespasses.” (Matt. xviii. 35.) According to this text, a Christian may forfeit his justification, his sins be revived against him, and he rest under condemnation the same as though he had never been forgiven. There is no salvation from which all contingency is removed, finished and complete, this side of a glorified state in heaven. There is a glory which the Christian here has not yet realized, a glory still deferred. The resurrection of the body and the glorification of both soul and body in heaven are, to the one who dwells on the earth, things of the future. According to the text already quoted from Romans, the body is to be redeemed from vanity, death, and the grave. There is to be a resurrection of the dead. “For the hour is coming, in the which all that are in the graves shall hear his voice, and shall come forth; they that have done good, unto the resurrection of life; and they that have done evil, unto the resurrection of damnation.” (John v. 28, 29.) “But now is Christ risen from the dead, and become the first-fruits of them that slept.” (1 Cor. xv. 20.) Here is the resurrection of Christ, and here is the manifestation and guarantee of the resurrection of all the sleeping saints. Christ has risen, and given promise, pledge, and hope of the resurrection of all who have died in the faith. “Every man in his own order: Christ the first-fruits; afterward they that are Christ’s at his coming.” (1 Cor. xv. 23.) When Christ shall come, at the end of the world, to judge the quick and the dead, the last enemy, death, shall be destroyed; the dead shall be raised

up, and the bodies of those who sleep in Jesus shall be changed from corruptible to incorruptible. Then death shall be swallowed up in victory. The resurrection does not precede the death of the body, nor take place before the end of the world. The body which here labors in pain, and is continually in bondage to death, and which finally falls into the grave, and into dust, will at the last day, when the earth shall pass away with a great noise, be raised up. The same body buried in the grave shall be raised up. The body is to be raised up by the power of God, not sprout or come up by the power and process of germination. The body in which Enoch walked with God was the body which was translated to heaven, and refined, spiritualized, and glorified. Elijah went up by a whirlwind into heaven in the same body in which he stood on the top of Carmel, and in which he crossed over the Jordan. The same body in which Lazarus lived, and which was put in the grave when he was dead, was the body which was raised up by Jesus, when he said, "Lazarus, come forth." There was no germination in this rising from the dead. The body of Jesus which was nailed to the cross, and buried in Joseph's new tomb, was the identical body which rose on the third day after the crucifixion, and which ascended to heaven after forty days' sojourn on earth. This gives pledge and token, guarantee and demonstration, that the identical bodies of the saints, which sleep in the graves, shall be raised up at the last day. The resurrection is not past already, as some, who have erred concerning the truth, say, but it is an event for the future; and the foundation on which it is promised standeth sure. God knows who are his, and them he will raise up at the last day. The resurrection of all the dead, as it was in the resurrection of Jesus, is to be effected by the power of God, and not by the law and process of germination.

“Why should it be thought a thing incredible with you, that God should raise the dead?” (Acts xxvi. 8.) God, who existed before there was any thing; God, who made light shine out of darkness; God, who devised and acted before there was any material nature and any material laws; God, who created from nothing all things which appear to human recognition, can raise up and give life to the dead. In the valley which was full of dry bones, there stood up upon their feet an exceeding great army of living men.

The guarantee of the resurrection of the dead gives hope to the Christian—hope not for this life only, but for the life which is to come. The resurrection of the dead is a consummation devoutly waited for by the children of God. This is the victory for which they sigh, wait, and hope. With lively anticipation, and with unspeakable joy, these sons of God continually exclaim: “Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, which, according to his abundant mercy, hath begotten us again unto a lively hope by the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead, to an inheritance incorruptible, and undefiled, and that fadeth not away, reserved in heaven.” (1 Pet. i. 3–5.) It may be repeated, that to all who dwell below the sun salvation is something not yet secured. Though the true Christian has already been justified and regenerated, salvation, as a complete and consummated estate, is yet to be attained through labor and trial—through labor yet to be performed and trial yet to be endured. Hence the injunction to Christians is, “Work out your own salvation with fear and trembling.” Where salvation has been attained, completed, and confirmed, hope can have no existence, and in such case hope cannot save. Why wait and hope for that which has been already possessed? At this juncture a definition of hope may very properly be given. Hope is defined in the Bible, and, as there defined, is neither introspective nor retrospect-

ive, but is prospective. The things hoped for are future. That which has been already attained is not hoped for, is not waited for, is neither sought nor expected. To all this the apostle testifies: "But hope that is seen is not hope; for what a man seeth, why doth he yet hope for? But if we hope for that we see not, then do we with patience wait for it." (Rom. viii. 24, 25.) That which is attainable is expected, that which is desirable is waited for and sought after. *Hope is, therefore, the desire and expectation of an obtainable object or state of intrinsic value.* Hope is the opposite of despair. While hope survives, though grief may harass and bondage oppress, despair cannot exist.

Salvation is ascribed to hope. Enervation and effeminaey will discourage action and retard effort. Hope saves inasmuch as it imparts energy, fortitude, and strength for working out salvation. It is hope which encourages the heart, supports the purpose, and prompts to perseverance under the perplexities, toils, and vanities of the present Christian state. Hope imparts courage in the presence of enemies, gives holy boldness in the presence of contests and oppositions, and it inspires that endurance which achieves the victory and gains the crown. Christians have to meet numerous conflicts and endure many tribulations before they reach the kingdom. They are assailed by enemies, buffeted by foes, oppressed by cares, and are often in heaviness through manifold temptations. Hope propels with conquering power, lifts up the sinking head, strengthens the feeble knees. There is an excellency in the dignity with which hope faces dangers and triumphs over antagonists. "We glory in tribulations also; knowing that tribulation worketh patience; and patience, experience; and experience, hope; and hope maketh not ashamed." (Rom. v. 3-5.)

in navigating the wide and surging sea the mariner, ever

and anon, encounters rocks and shoals, adverse winds and raging billows, and gathering tempests and furious storms. Appalled by raging elements and imperiled by approaching dangers, in the emergency and in the extremity the mariner casts out the indispensable anchor. By this anchor the ship is held in safety, and the mariner is saved from the perils of the sea, by which he was surrounded. Likewise the Christian, in crossing the sea of life, is served and saved by hope which he has "as an anchor of the soul, both sure and steadfast, and which entereth into that within the veil."

Hope saves the Christian inasmuch as it governs his conversation and makes him persevering in every good word and work. He who has hope of finally resting with God will be cautious in his ways and zealous in every holy cause. He who has hope of finally reaching the goodly land of promise and the glorious city of the great King will be induced thereby to quicken his pace, and to hold on in his course. He who has hope of reigning as a king and as a priest with Christ will give diligence to make his calling and election sure. "Beloved, now are we the sons of God, and it doth not yet appear what we shall be; but we know that, when he shall appear, we shall be like him; for we shall see him as he is. And every man that hath this hope in him purifieth himself, even as he is pure." (1 John iii. 2, 3.) The Christian is allied to God by the most sacred relations, and by an acquired character, and by a renewed nature. He is a child of God. Of this there is no doubt. The Holy Spirit himself bears witness to this truth. But more is in reservation for him. There is a glory yet to be revealed, a benediction yet to be conferred. There is a mastery yet to be achieved, a kingdom yet to be attained. The Christian shall, by and by, enter into the King's palace, and God shall be seen and known as he is in the heights

of his glory and holiness. Then, the final mastery achieved, he shall be with the Lord of hosts, and shall shout unto him with the voice of triumph. The saint who was here subjected to vanity, and walked under clouds and darkness, shall, in the New Jerusalem, behold the beauty of the Lord, and, participating in his glorious praise, he shall set forth the honor of the divine name forever. He that is inspired with the hope of this exaltation and this renown will continually seek to be pure. This hope induces him to labor for this purity, and inasmuch as it produces this labor, care, and purity, it thus saves him. Knowing that he is to be with God, the Infinite, and in heaven, the holy place, he labors to maintain a suitable preparation for the association of the place to which he is to go. When reverses overwhelm and sorrows oppress, when "days are dark and friends are few," hope lifts up the head, sustains the spirit, and cheers the heart. Thus hope saves.

Prayer and praise, the active work of charity, and good deeds in general, and holding forth the word of life in the interest of mankind, are all enjoined in the life and work of salvation.

Divine revelation portrays the work of salvation in its order, steps, stages, and circumference. The beginning and the ending of the work of salvation are both exhibited. One is found in the inceptive institution of the redemptive scheme, and the other is found in the final glorification of those who love God. "And we know that all things work together for good to them that love God, to them who are the called according to his purpose. For whom he did foreknow, he also did predestinate to be conformed to the image of his Son, that he might be the first-born among many brethren. Moreover, whom he did predestinate, them he also called; and whom he called, them he also justified; and whom he justified, them he also glorified." (Rom.

viii. 28-30.) The work of Christ shall be completed, not destroyed; consummated, not annihilated. When the end of the world has come, when the redeemed of the earth have been glorified with Christ in the eternal paradise, the triumph of God will be complete, all opposing rule, authority, and power being then subdued and suppressed. Here is the termination of the mediatorial dispensation of the Son of God. This mediatorial reign shall terminate because its work is finished, because its achievements are complete. The battle fought, the victory won, the triumph achieved, the work of redemption consummated, the triune God is all in all.

THE END.









BT
751
V4

**THE LIBRARY
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA
Santa Barbara**

**THIS BOOK IS DUE ON THE LAST DATE
STAMPED BELOW.**

APR 3 1985

APR 10 1985





PSB

UC SOUTHERN REGIONAL LIBRARY FACILITY



A 001 009 058 7

